

WYCLIFFE COLLEGE LIBRARY

3 1761 02871 2339



LIBRARY

**Wycliffe College**

TORONTO

*J.W.*  
Shelf No. BS 2665.G36

Register No. 8060





THE  
EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL  
TO THE  
ROMANS.

*WITH NOTES AND INTRODUCTION.*

By E. H. GIFFORD, D.D.,

ARCHDEACON OF LONDON AND CANON OF ST. PAUL'S, EXAMINING  
CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP OF LONDON.

*REPRINTED FROM THE "SPEAKER'S COMMENTARY."*

LONDON :  
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.  
1886.

**UNIFORM WITH THE PRESENT VOLUME.**

---

**THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.** With Notes and Introduction.  
By CANON WESTCOTT, D.D. Medium 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**THE BOOK OF PSALMS.** With Notes and Introduction. By  
DEAN JOHNSON, and CANONS C. J. ELLIOTT and F. C. COOK. Medium  
8vo. 10s. 6d.

## CONTENTS.

---

### THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

INTRODUCTION, COMMENTARY, AND CRITICAL NOTES. BY THE REV.  
E. H. GIFFORD, D.D., ARCHDEACON OF LONDON AND CANON OF  
ST. PAUL'S, EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP OF LONDON.

PP. 1-238.

	PAGE		PAGE
§ 1. AUTHORSHIP . . . . .	1	§ 8. INTEGRITY OF THE EPISTLE . . . . .	20
§ 2. TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING	1	I. <i>Testimony of the early Fathers</i> . . . . .	20
I. <i>Notes of Time and Place in xv., xvi.</i> . . . . .	2	II. <i>Testimony of existing Manuscripts</i> . . . . .	22
II. <i>Indications of Time in Rom. i. 10-13</i> . . . . .	2	III. <i>Internal Evidence</i> . . . . .	25
(a) <i>The Doxology</i> . . . . .	25	(b) <i>Chapters xv., xvi.</i> . . . . .	26
§ 3. LANGUAGE . . . . .	3	§ 9. AUTHORITIES FOR THE TEXT . . . . .	30
§ 4. JEWS IN ROME . . . . .	3	§ 10. CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE . . . . .	32
§ 5. CHRISTIANS IN ROME . . . . .	4	APPENDIX.—“THE LAW,” “THE FLESH” . . . . .	41
§ 6. OCCASION OF WRITING . . . . .	8		
§ 7. THE PURPOSE OF THE EPISTLE	9		

#### ADDITIONAL NOTES :

On chap. i. 1, 4, 8, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 23, 24, 32 . . . . .	68
On chap. ii. 8, 16 . . . . .	81
On chap. iii. 9, 25 . . . . .	96
On chap. iv. 1, 2, 25 . . . . .	108
On chap. v. 1, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12 . . . . .	122
On chap. vi. 5, 6, 13, 17, 21 . . . . .	133
On chap. vii. 1, 5, 6, 21, 25 . . . . .	144

#### ADDITIONAL NOTES :

On chap. viii. 2, 3, 9, 11, 28, 29, 35 . . . . .	164
On chap. ix. 5, 6, 8, 15, 17, 19, 31 . . . . .	178
On chap. x. 4, 15, 17 . . . . .	190
On chap. xi. 7, 9, 12, 13, 32 . . . . .	203
On chap. xiii. 1 . . . . .	215
On chap. xiv. 11 . . . . .	221
On chap. xvi. 7, 25 . . . . .	238



# ROMANS.

## INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. AUTHORSHIP . . . . .	PAGE	§ 8. INTEGRITY OF THE EPISTLE . . . . .	PAGE
§ 2. TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING	I	I. <i>Testimony of the early Fathers</i>	20
<i>I. Notes of Time and Place in xv., xvi.</i>	2	II. <i>Testimony of existing Manuscripts</i>	20
<i>II. Indications of Time in Rom. i. 10-13</i>	2	III. <i>Internal Evidence</i>	22
§ 3. LANGUAGE . . . . .	3	(a) <i>The Doxology</i>	25
§ 4. JEWS IN ROME . . . . .	3	(b) <i>Chapters xv., xvi.</i>	26
§ 5. CHRISTIANS IN ROME . . . . .	4	§ 9. AUTHORITIES FOR THE TEXT	30
§ 6. OCCASION OF WRITING . . . . .	8	§ 10. CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE.	32
§ 7. THE PURPOSE OF THE EPISTLE	9	APPENDIX.—“THE LAW,” “THE FLESH” . . . . .	41

### § 1. AUTHORSHIP.

THE title of the Epistle in the oldest manuscripts is simply *πρὸς Ρωμαίους*, “To the Romans;” but the first word of the Epistle itself names St. Paul as its author, and it has been universally accepted in all ages as his genuine work.

It is quoted very early, though not, as some have supposed, in the New Testament itself.

Thus in 2 Pet. iii. 15 there is an allusion to St. Paul’s teaching, which in consequence of a slight resemblance in the language has been thought to refer especially to Rom. ii. 4; but St. Peter, as the context clearly shows, is referring to the moral exhortation found in all St. Paul’s Epistles, based as it commonly is on the expectation of Christ’s second coming.

The supposed allusion in St. James (ii. 14) to St. Paul’s teaching in the Epistle to the Romans is inconsistent with the friendly and confidential intercourse of these two Apostles (Acts xv. 4, 25; Gal. ii. 9), and with the earlier date at which St. James most probably wrote. On this point, however, the reader must refer to the full discussion in the Commentary on St. James.

But the Epistle is certainly quoted

before the end of the 1st century by Clement of Rome in a passage which will be found in the Additional Note on i. 32: in the 2nd century it is quoted by Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, and Ireneus: the last-named Father repeatedly and expressly refers to it as the work of St. Paul (III. xvi. 3, 9). The internal evidence of its genuineness has carried conviction to the minds of the most cautious and the most sceptical of critics. Every chapter, in fact, bears the impress of the same mind from which the Epistles to the Churches of Corinth and Galatia undoubtedly proceeded; and even Baur and the critics of his school, who make every effort to prove the two last chapters spurious, are obliged to admit that the rest of the Epistle is the genuine work of St. Paul.

### § 2. TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

The passages which contain definite historical statements indicating the time and place at which the Epistle was written are all contained in the last two chapters, xv. 25-31; xvi. 1, 2, 21, 23.

But the time and place of writing can also be inferred with great probability from indirect evidence contained in i. 10, 11, 13.

This latter proof is quite independent

## INTRODUCTION.

of the former, and when combined with it forms an undesigned coincidence between the first and last chapters of the Epistle, and a valuable confirmation of the genuineness of chapters xv. and xvi., which of late years has been much disputed.

**I. Notes of Time and Place in xv., xvi.**

At the time of writing this Epistle St. Paul was going to carry to the poor saints at Jerusalem a contribution made for them in Macedonia and Achaia (xv. 25, 26), and he hoped afterwards to visit Rome on his way to Spain (xv. 28). If we compare these passages with Acts xix. 21 and xx. 3, it is clear that the Epistle must have been written after the Apostle's arrival in Greece on his third missionary journey, when he spent three months in Corinth.

The same conclusion follows from comparing Romans xv. 25-28 with 1 Cor. xvi. 1-5, and 2 Cor. viii. 1-4, ix. 1, 2. In presence of the hostile criticism which is directed against the historical value of the Acts, it is worth notice that this second proof is independent of St. Luke's narrative.

Assuming, however, as we justly may, the authenticity and accuracy of St. Luke's history, we can fix almost within a week the date at which our Epistle was despatched.

For we learn from Acts xx. 3 that, as St. Paul was about to sail from Corinth into Syria, the Jews laid wait for him, and on this account he changed his route at the last moment and determined to return through Macedonia.

The Epistle, if written after these incidents, would almost certainly have contained some reference to them, and especially to the plot of the Jews, which the Apostle could not have failed to notice in alluding to the enmity of his countrymen in ch. xv. 31. We may, therefore, confidently infer that the letter was despatched before St. Paul actually left Achaia, and yet not long before (xv. 25).

The winter was at an end and navigation had recommenced, for "he was about to sail into Syria" (Acts xx. 3).

Yet the spring was not far advanced, for after travelling through Macedonia to Miletus (Acts xx. 16) he still hoped to reach Jerusalem by Pentecost.

We can fix the season even more exactly: for St. Paul and his company spent "*the days of unleavened bread*" at Philippi (Acts xx. 6), and must therefore have left Corinth some time before the Passover.

The proof that the Epistle was written from Corinth is well stated by Theodoret: "First, he commands to them Phoebe, calling her a deaconess of the Church at Cenchreae (xvi. 1); and Cenchreae is a port of the Corinthians. And then he also speaks thus: '*Gaius mine host saluteth you*' (xvi. 23). Now that Gaius was of Corinth is easy to learn from the First Epistle to the Corinthians, for he writes to them thus: '*I thank my God that I baptized none of you, save Crispus and Gaius*' (1 Cor. i. 14).

To these arguments of Theodoret we may add that four of the seven persons named in Rom. xvi. 21-23—Timotheus, Sosipater, Jason, and Gaius—can be shown with great probability to have been with St. Paul during his second abode at Corinth. The conclusion from these various proofs is that the Epistle to the Romans was written from Corinth shortly before Easter A.D. 58.

**II. Indications of Time in i. 10-13.**

We read in this passage that the writer has not yet been at Rome, but is longing to visit the believers there, and has "*oftentimes purposed*" to come unto them, but has been "*hindered hitherto*." This purpose of visiting Rome St. Paul publicly declared during the latter part of his abode at Ephesus: "*After these things were ended Paul purposed in the spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem, saying, After I have been there, I must also see Rome*" (Acts xix. 21).

We do not know how long the Apostle had entertained the purpose here for the first time recorded: there is no indication nor probability that it entered into the plan of his first journey to Europe

(Acts xvi. 9—xviii. 18). But we may conjecture with some probability that the desire to visit Rome had been first kindled by St. Paul's intercourse with Aquila and Priscilla when they had lately come from Italy to Corinth (Acts xviii. 1), and fostered by constant association with them during the journey from Corinth to Ephesus (Acts xviii. 26; xix. 1, 10; 1 Cor. xvi. 19). The distinct purpose therefore of visiting Rome could hardly have been formed before St. Paul's abode at Ephesus, nor could the statement in Rom. i. 10–13 have been made before the latter part of that period, a considerable lapse of time being implied in the words "*oftentimes I purposed to come unto you, but was let hitherto.*"

Again, by comparison with the contents of the Corinthian Epistles it may be clearly proved that the Epistle to the Romans must have been written after 2 Corinthians (see Bp. Lightfoot, 'Galatians,' p. 48): that is to say, after the latter part of the year 57. Thus we are brought very close to the time indicated in Rom. xv., xvi., and have found an independent proof of the correctness of the dates given in those chapters.

### § 3. LANGUAGE.

Salmeron (Proleg. I. 35) supposed the Epistle to have been originally composed in Latin, because it was addressed to Latins, written by an amanuensis who bore a Latin name, Tertius, and dictated by an Apostle who must have known Latin, as having the gift of tongues. Cornelius à Lapide discusses this fanciful notion, and modifies it by suggesting that St. Paul's Greek autograph was translated into Latin by Tertius and the translation sent to Rome. The error arose from ignorance of the fact, now well established, that for a considerable part of the first three centuries "the Church of Rome, and most if not all the Churches of the West, were, if we may so speak, Greek religious colonies. Their language was Greek, their organisation Greek, their writers Greek, their Scriptures Greek" (Milman, 'Latin Christianity,' I. i.).

Accordingly, in the Epistle itself we find St. Paul classifying mankind as "Greeks and Barbarians" (i. 14) or "Jews and Greeks" (i. 16; ii. 9, 10; iii. 9; x. 12); and in the salutations in ch. xvi. the names both of Jewish and Gentile converts are nearly all Greek.

### § 4. JEWS IN ROME.

When we pass from the author to his readers, our thoughts turn first to the origin of the Jewish colony in Rome. The first embassy sent from Jerusalem to Rome by Judas Maccabaeus, B.C. 161, obtained from the Senate a treaty of mutual defence and friendship, which was renewed successively by Jonathan, B.C. 144, by Simon, B.C. 141, and by John Hyrcanus, B.C. 129: see 1 Macc. viii. 17, xii. 1, xiv. 24; and Josephus, 'Antiq.' xiii. 1.

Of the Jews who came to Rome in the train of these frequent embassies some would certainly settle there, for the commercial advantages of residence in the great capital would not be neglected by the enterprising race which was rapidly spreading over all the civilised world.

The first notice in Latin literature of the Jews in Rome seems to be the well-known passage in Cicero's defence of L. Valerius Flaccus (c. 28), where we learn that the Jews were accustomed to send gold every year from Italy to Jerusalem, and formed in Rome itself a faction so numerous and formidable that the great orator points to them as thronging at that moment the steps of the Aurelian tribunal, and lowers his voice in pretended terror lest they should overhear his words. These wealthy and influential Jews must have been settled in Rome long before the captives whom Pompey brought from Jerusalem to adorn his triumph only two years before the date of Cicero's oration, B.C. 59.

But Pompey's captives were in course of time set free by those who had bought them for slaves (Philo, Jud. 'de Legat.' c. 23), and the Jewish community in Rome was thus greatly increased. Julius Cæsar treated them with singular favour, and expressly sanctioned their worship

## INTRODUCTION.

in their synagogues (*Jos. 'Antiq.' xiv. c. 10, 8*), and the same privileges were continued by Augustus and Tiberius (*Philo, ib.*). "The great division of Rome which is on the other side of the Tiber was occupied by the Jews" (*Philo*), and so numerous were they, that when Archelaus came to Rome (A.D. 2) to secure the succession on the death of Herod, 8000 of the Jews dwelling in Rome took part against him (*Jos. 'B. J.' ii. 6; 'Antiq.' xvii. c. 11, 1*).

The favour of the Caesars was in marked contrast to the contempt and hatred with which the Romans in general looked upon the Jews. Cicero calls them a nation "born for slavery" ('*De Prov.*' c. 10), and their religion a barbarous superstition, abhorrent to the ancestral institutions of Rome and to the glory of its empire ('*Pro Flacco*', c. 28). Horace refers to their proselytising zeal (1 'Sat.' iv. 143), their seeming credulity (v. 100), and the mingled contempt and fear with which their religious rites were regarded (x. 69-72). Josephus ('*Antiq.*' xviii. 3, 5) tells how the fraud which four Jewish impostors practised on one of their female converts moved Tiberius to expel all Jews from Rome and send 4000 of them to serve as soldiers in Sardinia. But neither exile nor persecution, though repeated under successive Emperors, could drive the Jews permanently from Rome. They soon returned, and their power so increased that, in Seneca's words (August. 'de Civ. D.' vi. 11), "the conquered race gave laws to its conquerors."

## § 5. CHRISTIANS IN ROME.

If we ask at what time and by whom the Gospel was first preached at Rome, we have to consider sundry answers presented by ecclesiastical tradition.

First we are told in the Clementine Homilies that in the reign of Tiberius tidings came to Rome "that a certain one in Judæa, beginning in the spring season, was preaching to the Jews the kingdom of the invisible God," and working many wonderful miracles and signs (*Hom. i. c. 6*).

"In the same year in the autumn sea-

son a certain one standing in a public place cried and said, "Men of Rome, hearken. The Son of God is come in Judæa, proclaiming eternal life to all who will, if they shall live according to the counsel of the Father, who hath sent Him" (c. 7).

These statements of the Pseudo-Clement are of course purely fictitious.

Another marvellous story is recorded by Tertullian ('*Apologeticus*', c. 5) : "Tiberius, accordingly, in whose days the Christian name made its entry into the world, having himself received intelligence from Palestine of events which had clearly shown the truth of Christ's divinity, brought the matter before the Senate, with his own decision in favour of Christ. The Senate, because it had not given the approval itself, rejected his proposal."

The tale bears on its face all the marks of untruth (Neander, '*Church History*', i. 128), and Tertullian, who was no critic, had probably been deceived by some of the many spurious "Acts of Pilate."

We come next to two traditions, perfectly distinct in their origin, which ascribe the foundation of the church at Rome to St. Peter.

A. The former of these traditions, which represents St. Peter as preaching at Rome in the reign of Claudius, arose as follows :—

(1) Justin Martyr in his first *Apology*, addressed to Antoninus Pius, writes thus (c. 26) : "There was one Simon, a Samaritan, of the village called Gitton, who in the reign of Claudius Cæsar, and in your royal city of Rome, did mighty feats of magic by the art of dæmons working in him. He was considered a god, and as a god was honoured among you with a statue, which statue was set up in the river Tiber between the two bridges, and bears this inscription in Latin :

"'Simoni Deo Sancto,'

which is,

"To Simon the holy God."

The substance of this story is repeated by Irenæus ('*adv. Hær.*' I. xxiii. 1), and by Tertullian ('*Apol.*' c. 13), who re-

proaches the Romans for installing Simon Magus in their Pantheon, and giving him a statue and the title "Holy God."

In A.D. 1574 a stone, which had formed the base of a statue, was dug up on the site described by Justin, the island in the Tiber, bearing an inscription: "Semoni Sanco Deo Fidio Sacrum," &c. Hence it has been supposed that Justin mistook a statue of the Sabine God, "Semo Sancus," for one of Simon Magus. See the notes in Otto's *Justin Martyr* and Stieren's *Irenaeus*.

On the other hand Tillemont ('*Mémoires*', t. ii. p. 482) maintains that Justin in an Apology addressed to the emperor and written in Rome itself cannot reasonably be supposed to have fallen into so manifest an error.

Whichever view we take of Justin's accuracy concerning the inscription and the statue, there is nothing improbable in his statement that Simon Magus was at Rome in the reign of Claudius. Only we must observe that Justin says not one word about St. Peter's alleged visit to Rome and his encounter with Simon Magus.

(2.) Papias, "a man of very small mind" (*Euseb. Eccl. Hist.* iii. 39) says that the Presbyter John used to say that Mark, "the interpreter of Peter," recorded his teaching accurately.

Here there is no mention of *Simon Magus*, nor of the *time* and *place* of St. Peter's preaching.

(3.) Clement of Alexandria (c. A.D. 200), quoted by Eusebius ('E. H.' vi. 14), repeats "a tradition from the elders of former times," that "after Peter had publicly preached the word in Rome," Mark at the request of the hearers wrote what he had said, and so composed his gospel.

Here again the *time* of Peter's preaching at Rome is not mentioned.

Before we pass on it is most important to observe that these traditions preserved by Papias and Clement have not the slightest connexion of *persons*, *time*, or *place*, with Justin Martyr's story of Simon Magus.

(4.) Eusebius in his '*Ecclesiastical History*' (c. A.D. 325), quotes Justin

Martyr's story about Simon Magus ('E. H.' ii. c. 13), and then, without referring to any authority, goes on to assert (c. 14) that "immediately in the same reign of Claudius divine Providence led Peter the Great Apostle to Rome to encounter this great destroyer of life," and that he thus brought the light of the Gospel from the East to those in the West.

As the date of this visit to Rome Eusebius in the '*Chronicon*' gives A.D. 42, and says that Peter remained at Rome twenty years (see Canon Cook's article "Peter" in the 'Dictionary of the Bible').

This arbitrary and erroneous combination of traditions, which had no original connexion, may possibly have been suggested to Eusebius by the historical connexion between Simon Magus and St. Peter in Acts viii., or more probably he may have borrowed it from the strange fictions of the '*Clementine Recognitions*' and '*Homilies*', and '*Apostolic Constitutions*'. (See '*Recognitions*', iii. 63-65; '*Homilies*', I. xv. lviii.; '*Epistle of Clement to James*', c. i.; '*Apost. Constit.*' vi., viii., ix.)

That St. Peter was not at Rome, and had not previously been there, when St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, may be safely inferred from its silence concerning him, and from the fact that there is not a particle of trustworthy evidence in favour of any earlier visit.

B. The other tradition, which represents the Roman Church to have been founded by St. Peter and St. Paul jointly, rests on the following authorities.

(1.) Irenaeus III. c. 1: "Matthew published a written Gospel among the Hebrews in their own language, at the time when Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel at Rome and founding the Church. But after their departure (or according to a various reading, after Matthew's publication) Mark also the disciple and interpreter of Peter handed down to us in writing what was preached by Peter." Eusebius ('Eccles. Hist.' v. 8) cites this passage without noticing that it is inconsistent with his own statements in ii. 15 concerning the earlier foundation of the Roman Church by St. Peter, inasmuch as it expressly ascribes

## INTRODUCTION.

the foundation (*θεμελιώντων*) of that church to the simultaneous preaching of the two Apostles, which cannot possibly be assigned to that earlier date in the reign of Claudius.

(2.) Irenaeus III. c. iii. 2: "The greatest and most ancient and universally known Church, founded and established in Rome by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul."

Id. III. c. iii. 3. "Having therefore founded and built up the Church the blessed Apostles entrusted its episcopal ministrations to the hands of Linus."

(3.) Euseb. 'Eccl. Hist.' ii. 25: "Paul is related to have been beheaded in Rome itself, and Peter likewise to have been crucified in his (Nero's) time. And the story is accredited by the appellation of Peter and Paul having prevailed up to the present time on the tombs there (*κοιμητηρίων*)."

(4.) Ibid. Dionysius of Corinth writing to the Romans calls both their Church and that of Corinth a joint plantation of Peter and Paul, and adds that "having gone to Italy and taught together there they died as martyrs at the same time."

The tradition embodied in these passages clearly refers to the time of Nero's persecution, six or seven years later than the Epistle to the Romans, and throws no light upon the origin and earliest organisation of the Roman Church.

The Epistle itself, compared with the narrative in Acts, is the only trustworthy source of information on these points.

From i. 8-13 and xv. 23 it is certain that there had been for "many years" in Rome a considerable body of Christians whom St. Paul had a great desire to visit in person, but had hitherto been hindered.

This desire to visit them, and to have some fruit among them (i. 13), combined with his declared unwillingness to build on another man's foundation (xv. 18-24), and with his boldness in admonishing them (xv. 15) by virtue of his Apostolic authority, forbids us to suppose that the Roman Church had been founded by any other Apostle.

We may however assume, almost with certainty, that the rise of the new faith

in Jerusalem, and the great events by which it had been ushered in, must have been quickly known in Rome. Tacitus in fact expressly asserts this in his account of Nero's persecutions of the Christians, 'Annals' xv. 44: "The name was derived from Christ, who in the reign of Tiberius suffered under Pontius Pilate, the procurator of Judæa. By that event the sect of which he was the founder received a blow which for a time checked the growth of a dangerous superstition; but it revived *soon after*, and spread with recruited vigour not only in Judæa the soil which gave it birth, but even in the city of Rome, the common sink into which everything infamous and abominable flows like a torrent from all quarters of the world."

There was constant intercourse between the two great cities, and "some who had gone forth from Rome as Jews may well have returned thither as Christians" (Fritzsche). It is not improbable that some of the "*strangers of Rome*," i. e. Romans resident in Jerusalem, who witnessed the wonders of the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 10) may have been among the first to bring back the good tidings to the capital.

M. Godet ('Introduction,' p. 63) is unwilling to admit this explanation of the origin of the Church of Rome, as seeming to prove that the Gospel was spread in the city by means of the Synagogue. But the clear and positive statement of Tacitus, that Christianity *soon after* the death of its Founder spread even to the city of Rome, cannot be set aside for fear of any inferences that may be drawn from it.

Nor does it by any means follow that the Synagogue must have been the sole or chief channel through which a knowledge of the Gospel was diffused in Rome. If the first believers were Jews and Proselytes, to these there would soon be added Gentile Christians, who being either provincials had brought their new faith to Rome, or being Romans had learned it in the provinces; here a faithful centurion, and there a devout soldier of the Italian cohort, would bear witness at Rome of the things which he had seen and heard in Jerusalem.

The number of believers would rapidly increase: as the first teachers of the Gospel were driven forth by persecution, or by their own missionary zeal, beyond the bounds of Palestine (Acts viii. 1, 4; xi. 19; xii. 17; xiii. 3), every province that was traversed by an Apostle, every city in which a Christian church was founded, would help to swell the number of Christians drawn together in Rome from all parts of the empire.

But believers, few or many, scattered over a great city do not constitute a Church such as those which the Apostles founded. Did such a Church, duly organised, exist in Rome when St. Paul wrote this Epistle? No trace of such organisation is found either in the Epistle itself, or in the narrative of St. Paul's subsequent residence at Rome (Acts xxviii.).

If we put aside the circular letters, "Ephesians" and "Colossians," we find that in all St. Paul's Epistles addressed to Churches which are known to have been fully organised there is some mention of "the Church" (i. ii. Thess., i. ii. Cor., Gal.), or of "the Bishops and Deacons" (Phil. i. 1). But in "Romans" there is nothing of the kind, either in the address, or in the body of the letter, or in the final salutations.

The only "Church" mentioned is the little assembly in the house of Aquila and Priscilla (xvi. 5): the only reference to ecclesiastical ministers, teachers, or rulers is in xii., 4-8, a statement of the general principles of Church order, which proves the need rather than the existence of such an organisation in the Christian community at Rome as would secure the well-regulated exercise of individual gifts.

The whole tone of the exhortations in chapters xii., xiv., and especially in xii. 10, seems to imply a community of Christian brethren, in which none had yet been invested with superior authority.

The evidence thus furnished by the Epistle itself is too strong to be set aside by mere conjecture. We cannot agree with Meyer's opinion (p. 20, E. Tr.) that the existence of "a Church formally constituted may be gathered from the

general analogy of other Churches that had already been long in existence:" much less with his further assumption,—"Especially may the existence of a body of Presbyters, which was essential to Church organisation (Acts xiv. 23), be regarded as a matter of course."

The formal organisation of a Church, and the existence of a body of Presbyters, can be inferred from the analogy of other Churches, only in a case where it is known that Apostolic authority has been exercised. Meyer himself thus writes (p. 22) concerning the Roman community at an earlier period: "Individual Christians were there, and certainly also Christian fellowship, but still no organised Church. To plant such a Church there was needed, as is plain from the analogy of all other cases of the founding of Churches with which we are acquainted, *official action* on the part of teachers *endowed directly or indirectly with Apostolic authority*."

Meyer evidently argues in a circle:

"Other Churches, namely those which had been founded by Apostles, were formally organised:

Therefore we infer, by analogy, that Rome was formally organised:

Therefore Rome must have been Apostolically founded."

Setting aside such precarious inferences from an unproved analogy, we gather from the Epistle itself that the Christians at Rome were not as yet a Church fully and formally organised. Rather they were a large and "mixed community of Jew and Gentile converts," well described by Bishop Lightfoot ('Phil.' p. 13) as "a heterogeneous mass, with diverse feelings and sympathies, with no well-defined organisation, with no other bond of union than the belief in a common Messiah; gathering, we may suppose, for purposes of worship in small knots here and there, as close neighbourhood or common nationality or sympathy or accident drew them together; but, as a body, lost in the vast masses of the heathen population, and only faintly discerned or contemptuously ignored even by the large community of Jewish residents."

We may gather from the Epistle that

St. Paul had before his mind all the chief elements of this mixed community of Christians, as well as the unconverted Jews and heathens among whom they lived.

There were Jews of the Synagogue to whom the Gospel had not yet been preached, or by whom it had been long since rejected, and who appear three years later to have been still wrapped up in contemptuous ignorance of "this sect," which "is everywhere spoken against" (Acts xxviii. 22). As in St. Luke's narrative the Apostle's first care within three days after his arrival in Rome is to call "the chief of the Jews together," and to expound unto them "the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus:" so in the Epistle he writes (i. 16), "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; *to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.*"

Again when he writes, "Oftentimes I purposed to come unto you, that I might have some fruit among you also, even as among other Gentiles: I am debtor both to the Greeks and to the Barbarians" (i. 13, 14), it is clear that he hopes to preach the Gospel to Gentiles at Rome who had not yet heard it.

Within the Christian community itself there were many various sections: Jews of Palestine, some of whom, like Andronicus and Junias, Paul's kinsmen and fellow-prisoners, were of note among the Apostles in Jerusalem, and were also in Christ before Paul himself (xvi. 7): Jews of the Dispersion, like Aquila of Pontus and his wife Priscilla, Paul's chosen disciples and devoted friends: proselytes of Rome, now turned to Christ: Gentile Christians, of whom some, like the well-beloved Epaenetus the first-fruits of Asia unto Christ (xvi. 5) had been St. Paul's own converts; others, like Amplias, Urban, Stachys, his helpers in Christ or friends beloved in the Lord; others again unknown by face, whom yet he salutes by name as "chosen in the Lord," or "approved in Christ," while of the great majority he only knew that their faith was spoken of throughout the whole world.

### § 6. OCCASION OF WRITING.

Dean Alford has justly observed that in answering the question, with what object was the Epistle written? critics have not sufficiently borne in mind that "*the occasion of writing* an Epistle is one thing,—*the great object* of the Epistle itself, another."

The distinction is in the present case most appropriate, for while the determination of the *main object* of the Epistle is one of the most disputed problems of modern criticism, the immediate *occasion of writing* is clearly stated by the Apostle himself. He had heard the faith of the Roman Christians everywhere spoken of (i. 8), and for many years had felt a longing desire to visit them (i. 11; xv. 23): he had often definitely purposed to do so (i. 13), and had been as often (*τὰ πολλά*, xv. 22) hindered.

A year before, when at Ephesus, he had purposed in the Spirit to go through Macedonia and Achaia, and thence to Jerusalem (Acts xix. 21), "saying, *After I have been there, I must also see Rome.*" He had completed that portion of his journey which brought him nearest to Rome, and was now turning back from Corinth to the far East, going bound in the Spirit to Jerusalem, and already foreseeing that danger awaited him there from the unbelieving Jews (xv. 31).

He still longs and hopes to see Rome (i. 10), but already he is looking beyond it to the distant West: Rome is to be, as he hopes, a resting-place for brief sojourn on his way to Spain (xv. 24, 28).

The cause of this change or extension of his plan is not stated, but it probably sprang from the great conflict of the past year against Jews and Judaizing Christians, the records of which are his Epistles to the Corinthians and Galatians. Hitherto he had preached the Gospel everywhere to the Jews first, but their general rejection of it was now an established fact (ix. 1; x. 3), over which he mourned, but in which he saw an intimation of God's will that he should now devote himself more exclusively to his own sphere of Apostolic labour, and go far off unto the Gentiles.

His visit to Jerusalem with the alms of the Gentiles might be perhaps intended as a farewell token of his love (Gal. ii. 10). A considerable time must elapse before he could reach Rome, and then his stay must be short : an Epistle would be useful for the present needs of the brethren there, and by preparing the way for his personal ministration would render his short sojourn more profitable.

*Phœbe*, a servant or deaconess of the Church in Cenchreæ, had business to transact in Rome (xvi. 1), and to her charge the Epistle would naturally be entrusted.

#### § 7. THE PURPOSE OF THE EPISTLE.

In comparing the Epistle to the Romans with the Epistles addressed by St. Paul to other Churches, we perceive at once that it is distinguished from them all as containing a more general and systematic statement of Christian doctrine. It is quite natural that this most striking peculiarity should have been the first object of attention to any who were seeking to discover the chief aim and purpose of the writing.

In the Muratorian Fragment, which contains the earliest extant catalogue of the books of the New Testament, written about 170 A.D., the author thus describes the four greater Epistles of St. Paul : "First of all he wrote to the Corinthians forbidding party schism, next to the Galatians forbidding circumcision ; but to the Romans he wrote at greater length concerning the plan of the Scriptures, showing at the same time that their foundation is Christ." (See Hilgenfeld, 'Einleitung in d. N. T.', pp. 88-107 ; Routh, 'Rell. Sacr.' i. 394 sqq. ; and Westcott on the Canon of the New Testament, p. 241.)

We observe that this earliest of Critics, while assigning to the Corinthian and Galatian letters special motives arising out of the particular circumstances of those Churches, attributes none but a perfectly general didactic purpose to the Epistle to the Romans.

*Origen*, in the preface to his Commentary, notices the difficulty of the Epistle, its indications of St. Paul's

progress towards Christian perfection, and the time and place of writing ; but *not the purpose*.

*Chrysostom* observes that St. Paul wrote to different Churches from different motives and on different subjects, and finds the motive of this Epistle in his desire to embrace the whole world in his ministry and to instruct the Romans, "because saith he, *of the grace that is given to me of God, that I should be the minister of Jesus Christ*" (xv. 15).

*Theodoret* says that "the inspired Apostle offers in this letter varied doctrine of all kinds."

*Ecumenius*, after noticing the personal introduction (i. 1-15), says "for the rest he makes his Epistle didactic."

*Luther* says in his Preface to the Epistle, that it "contains in itself the plan of the whole Scripture, and is a most complete epitome of the New Testament or Gospel, which Gospel it exhibits in the briefest and clearest manner."

*Calvin* writes : "The whole Epistle is so systematic, that even the exordium itself is composed according to the rules of art." He then gives an outline of the contents, in which he regards "justification by faith as the principal question of the whole Epistle," and the destiny of Israel (ix.—xi.) as a subordinate subject.

The Epistle is described in like manner by *Melanchthon* as a "compendium of Christian doctrine," and by *Grotius* as "addressed specially to the Romans, but containing all the defences (munimenta) of the Christian religion, in such wise that it well deserved that copies should be sent to other Churches."

*Reiche* in his Commentary on the Epistle, p. 84, abides "by the view that the Epistle to the Romans is to be regarded according to its *material aim* as a universal, popular representation, adapted to the time, of the necessity, glory, and divine excellence of the Christian method of salvation, with reference to manifold objections especially of the old Theocracy, combined with a brief exhibition of genuine Christian feeling and conduct ; but that its *formal aim* must be held to be

## INTRODUCTION.

*establishment in Christian faith and Christian virtue."*

Tholuck also, in his earlier editions, regards the design of the Epistle as "universal and *not founded on the peculiar circumstances of the Roman Church.*"

St. Paul, he thinks, undertakes an exposition of the entire scheme projected by the Divine Being for the salvation of mankind according as it is revealed to us in the Gospel; and afterwards, *as an appendage* to this, which is the larger portion of the letter, proceeds to the peculiar circumstances of the Church, so far as they were known to him.

Some of these statements are evidently exaggerated; but we must not on that account reject the truth which they contain. The Epistle does not "contain in itself a plan of the whole Scripture," nor is it "a complete epitome of the Gospel"; for there are whole provinces of revealed truth on which it scarcely touches. The range of its dogmatic teaching is rightly indicated in Melanchthon's question: "Is it not in reality on the Law, on Sin, and on Grace, that the knowledge of Christ depends?" And when Tholuck writes that St. Paul "wished to show how the Gospel, and the Gospel alone, fully answers to the soul's need of Salvation, a need which neither Paganism nor Judaism could satisfy," we can accept this representation as true in itself, but not as a complete or sufficient account of the whole purpose of the Epistle. It is, as all must admit, more didactic, methodical, and universal in its teaching than most of St. Paul's Epistles; and no statement of its purpose can be satisfactory which does not give full importance to this characteristic feature. Baur himself regards the Epistle "as a systematic work, dealing with a massive body of thought," and contrasts it with the Epistle to the Galatians, "the one being the first sketch of a bold and profound system as conceived in its characteristic and essential features, the other the completed system, developed on all sides, and provided with all necessary arguments and illustrations." ('Paul,' i. 309).

But this dogmatic system is not the only element that must be taken into consideration. What lies before us is not a manual of Christian doctrine nor a theological treatise, but a letter; and it is of the very essence of a letter that it arises out of special relations between the writer and his readers, by which its purpose is in great measure determined. In regard to this Epistle it has been too lightly assumed that a special motive is inconsistent with a general didactic purpose.

"The question," writes M. Godet, "stands thus: If we assign a special practical aim to the Epistle, we put ourselves, as it seems, in contradiction to the very general and quasi-systematic character of its contents. If on the contrary we ascribe to it a didactic and wholly general aim, it differs thereby from the other letters of St. Paul, all of which spring from some particular occasion, and have a definite aim." (i. p. 80).

We cannot regard this as a correct statement of the case: the supposed dilemma is purely fictitious. There is no necessary or natural opposition between a more general and a more special purpose: the two become opposed only when it is arbitrarily assumed that either of them is the complete and exclusive purpose; and to suggest an opposition which has no real existence is only to create an imaginary difficulty for the sake of refuting it.

The real difficulty lies not in the co-existence of a general and a special purpose, but in determining the exact nature of each, their respective limits and mutual relations.

We pass on then to consider the views of other interpreters who have endeavoured to discover the special circumstances which influenced the Apostle in writing this Epistle, in other words to determine its historical origin and purpose. We have seen already in § 5 that the Christians at Rome must have formed a community of diverse elements drawn from various nations and creeds, in which we may well believe that every variety of Christian thought and feeling found a place. We have

also seen that in comparison with St. Paul's other letters "the great character of the Epistle is its universality" (Bishop Wordsworth).

But this very character of universality, both in the letter and in the Community to which it is addressed, makes it more than usually difficult to determine the mutual relations of the different classes of Christians at Rome, and the special motive and purpose of the letter.

Another circumstance which adds to this difficulty is that St. Paul had not yet been at Rome, and consequently we have none of those life-like pictures and graphic strokes which set so vividly before our eyes the inner life of those Churches to which his earlier Epistles were addressed, Thessalonica, Corinth, and Galatia.

In such circumstances speculation has free scope, and theories are more easily formed than refuted. By exaggerating some features and disregarding others, it is easy to give an air of plausibility to very different views of the prevailing tendencies of thought and practice in the Christian Community at Rome, and of the corresponding purpose of the Epistle.

There is however one historical circumstance to which a primary importance is almost universally conceded. The great religious difficulty of the time was unquestionably "the relation of Judaism and Heathenism to each other, and of both to Christianity" (Baur, 'Paulus' i. 316), and more especially the fact that contrary, as it seemed, to God's promises, His chosen people were superseded by Gentiles (p. 317). No one can read the sections i. 18—iv. and ix.—xi., without perceiving that they have this as their common subject, treated in different ways.

Olshausen, of whom Baur speaks as exhibiting "the extreme point of the purely dogmatic view" (p. 312) finds in the Epistle to the Romans a purely objective statement of the nature of the Gospel, "grounded only on the general opposition between Jews and Gentiles, and not on a more special opposition in the Church itself between Judaizing and non-Judaizing Christians" ('Commentary,' p. 47).

This view, which is very similar to De Weite's, seems to err in insisting that the general question of the opposite relations of Jew and Gentile to the Gospel is the *only* historical ground of the Epistle, and in allowing even to this too little influence upon its main purpose.

Baur, by whom their views are keenly criticised, puts forward an entirely different theory, in support of which he is obliged "to advance a view of the occasion and purpose of writing the Epistle, which is radically different from the common one" ('Paul,' i. 310).

Although Baur's theory has not been accepted even by his own followers without great and essential modifications, it has formed the starting point of nearly all subsequent treatment of the subject, and must therefore be at least briefly examined.

(1) The three chapters ix.—xi. are "the germ and centre of the whole, from which the other parts sprang; and we should take our stand on these three chapters in order to enter into the Apostle's original conception, from which the whole organism of the Epistle was developed, as we have it especially in the first eight chapters. For this purpose we have first to examine the contents of chapters ix.—xi."

This assumption is by no means self-evident. At first sight it would appear at least more probable that to trace out the Apostle's line of thought correctly we should follow the order in which he has himself presented it: and if, in order to understand his discussion in i. 17—viii. 39, any indication of the occasion and purpose of his writing is necessary, it must certainly be right to seek that preliminary indication in i. 8—16, rather than in ix.—xi.

It is obvious also that by this mode of interpretation Baur, the professed champion of historical criticism, has justly incurred the charge brought against him by Schott (p. 4), that he has entirely ignored the historical method, and constructed the history out of his own dogmatic interpretation.

(2) The contents of ix.—xi. having been briefly and fairly stated, Baur rightly

## INTRODUCTION.

concludes that the subject treated by the Apostle "is both the relation of Judaism and heathenism to each other, and the relation of both to Christianity" (p. 316). He adds, "It certainly appears that he cannot have devoted so large a part of his Epistle to answering this question without some *special outward reason* prompting him to do so, such as may have arisen out of the circumstances of the Church at *Rome*."

The words which we have emphasized mark, as we believe, the prime fallacy of Baur's theory. He confuses the *occasion* of the letter with its *main object*: he seeks a *special* and *local cause*, when a *general* one is needed: he fails to distinguish a reason for addressing the letter to *Rome*, from the reason for writing a full and systematic discussion of a great question by which the *whole Christian Church was at that time agitated*, and which was and ever must be of the deepest interest to all Christians alike.

(3) The error in principle, which we have just noticed, leads to an ill-founded and, as we believe, mistaken view of the actual condition and circumstances of the Christian Community at Rome.

"I think," he writes (i. 331), "we are entitled to take it for granted that the section of the Roman Church to which the Epistle is addressed must have been the preponderating element in the Church; and if this be so, then the Church consisted mainly of Jewish Christians."

This being a point of chief importance not only in estimating Baur's theory, but in forming any correct view of the purpose of the Epistle, we must briefly examine the evidence which bears upon it.

In i. 2, 3 Baur thinks that "Old Testament ideas are studiously introduced, which show that the Apostle had Jewish-Christian readers in his eye when he addressed himself to the composition of the Epistle."

That a portion of St. Paul's readers were Jewish Christians is admitted by all on much surer evidence than is contained in these verses: but if the introduction of Old Testament ideas is

supposed to prove that the Jewish Christians were the preponderating element, it might as well be argued, on the same ground, that the Churches of Corinth and Galatia must have consisted mainly of Jewish Christians.

The meaning of the passage i. 5, 6 (*ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ἐν οἷς ἐστε καὶ ὑμεῖς κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*) is keenly discussed.

It is claimed on the one side as proving decisively that the majority of the readers addressed were Jewish Christians.

"In respect of the Jewish Christians, he speaks of the universality of his calling; it extended to all nations alike, and the Jewish Christians of Rome were not beyond its scope. In order to meet the objection that he was an Apostle of the Gentiles and had nothing to do with Jewish Christians, he speaks of the Jews as one people under the general term of the *ἔθνη* (the nations). He shows his credentials with regard to the Jewish Christians, to justify the Epistle which he is going to write" (Baur, 'Paul,' i. p. 333).

Volkmar ('Paulus Römerbrief,' p. 141) supports the same view:

"1-14. I seem indeed to be merely a Gentile-Apostle, but through the Christ have I been called to bring non-Gentile Christians (Messianer) also to the religious obedience which consists in faith in Christ, and thereby to help towards the establishment of peace even in a Church which is a stranger to peace."

This view, untenable as it really is, has unfortunately been attacked on the wrong points.

The rendering "*among all nations*," which is that of our A.V., is not only admissible, but in this context even preferable to that which is proposed instead of it,—"*among all the Gentiles*." See the note on the passage. Those who, like M. Godet, would affix to the words "*a definite, restricted, and quasi-technical sense, the nations in opposition to the chosen people*," seem to forget that they themselves acknowledge that there were some Jewish Christians among the readers addressed. Which meaning then

of the word “*nations*” is most suitable to the opening address, the natural meaning which includes all the readers without distinction, or the technical meaning which pointedly excludes a portion of them?

An impartial student, who has no *a priori* theory to support, will be disposed to admit that, in a letter addressed to a mixed community of Jewish and Gentile Christians, St. Paul could not possibly mean to exclude any by words which might be so understood as to include them all.

This comprehensive sense of the words “*among all nations*” is confirmed by the true meaning of v. 6, “*Among whom are ye also [the] called of Jesus Christ.*” Neither Baur nor his critics have seen the true connexion between this and the preceding verse. For while it would be superfluous to inform Gentiles *as such* that they were included “*among all the Gentiles*” (Godet), and equally superfluous to inform Jewish Christians that they *as Jews* were included “*among all the nations*” (Baur), it is neither superfluous nor irrelevant to remind both Jewish and Gentile Christians that their being already “*called of Jesus Christ*” is an *actual* proof that they are included in the commission of one who had received through Jesus Christ Himself “*grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith among all nations.*”

The great mass of the Gentile world was not as yet so called: the great mass of the Jews had rejected the calling. Thus the Apostle gracefully acknowledges the position of privilege which his readers had already attained, and turns it into a proof of his right to address them.

This meaning of v. 6 is well expressed by M. Reuss: “*et vous aussi, vous vous trouvez dans ce nombre comme appelés de Jésus-Christ.*”

Another much disputed passage is i. 13, 14, “*that I might have some fruit among you also, even as among other Gentiles,*” where the last words are better rendered “*as among the rest of the Gentiles.*”

Here also Baur and Volkmar (p. 73) assume that *θεοντων* means simply

“*nations*,” and draw the conclusion that St. Paul “speaks of the Jews as one people under the general term *θηντην.*” But we have not here the same emphatic universality which in v. 5 demands the comprehensive sense “*all nations.*”

Even if we admit that here also *θηντην* may mean simply “*nations*” without reference to the distinction between Jew and Gentile, we are still far from the conclusion that the Apostle has any thought in his mind of the Jews as a nation, or of Christians at Rome as Jewish Christians. For the antithesis must then have been “*among you (Jews), as among the rest of the nations:*” whereas now it is clearly this—“*among you (Romans), as among the rest of the nations.*” Even with this sense of *θηντην* therefore, the readers are regarded not as Jewish Christians, but simply as Romans.

However, we cannot but agree with the great majority of both ancient and modern interpreters (including among the latter Meyer, Reuss, Weizsäcker, Godet, Davidson) that this passage, v. 13, distinctly proves the Christian Community at Rome to have consisted mainly of Gentiles. See note on the verse.

In connexion with these two passages and the introduction of which they form part (i. 1-15), we must notice another mistake into which many writers have fallen in the eagerness of their opposition to Baur and his school. According to these latter, St. Paul wishes “to meet the objection that he was an Apostle of the Gentiles and had nothing to do with Jewish Christians” (Baur, ‘Paul,’ p. 333).

“Paul the Apostle of the Messiah Jesus wishes grace and peace to the Church of God in the capital of the World! I seem indeed to you to be merely an Apostle of the Greeks, but I am called by God Himself through Jesus Christ, to preach the Gospel of God’s Son in the Spirit to *all nations*, even Non-Hellenes, as ye Mosaic followers of Messiah for the most part are” (Volkmar, p. 1; compare p. 141).

“Moreover he brings forward in new forms of speech the universality of his office as an Apostle for the obedience of

## INTRODUCTION.

faith among all nations. For he, who at first had grounded his Apostolic claim upon the fact that he was called by God to be the Apostle of the Gentiles, as Peter to be the Apostle of the Jews (Gal. ii. 7), could now win the right to send a letter of Apostolic preaching to the Jewish Christians at Rome only in such a form by bringing prominently forward the universality of his commission" (Holsten, "Der Gedankengang des Römerbriefs," in the 'Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie,' 1879, No. 1, p. 101).

This representation of St. Paul as having been hitherto exclusively an Apostle of the Gentiles has been too lightly accepted by those who seek to draw from it an exactly opposite conclusion. It will be sufficient to quote as an example of this view the words of Weizsäcker in his excellent article "Upon the earliest Christian Church at Rome" in the 'Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie,' 1876, Part ii. p. 250: "Here it is not a question of the interpretation of the word (*ἐθνη*) in itself merely. He appeals to his own proper Apostolic mission, consequently to his Gentile Apostleship. By that alone the meaning is at once decided beyond question. St. Paul could not possibly express himself as he does in this introduction to the Epistle, if the Christians at Rome were even but for the more part a Jewish Christian Church. They belong to him because he is a *Gentile Apostle*. *As such he has not to do with the circumcised*, as is shown by his conversation with Peter, Gal. ii. 7, 8."

We may confidently say that St. Paul never took so limited and narrow a view of his Apostleship as is implied in the words which we have printed in italics. When he says that through Jesus Christ he "received grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith among all nations" (v. 5), he is certainly not thinking of the arrangement made with St Peter (Gal. ii. 7-9), but of that Apostleship which was "*not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead*" (Gal. i. 1), of that voice which had said to Ananias, "*Go thy way: for*

*he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel*" (Acts ix. 15), and of the words of Ananias himself "*Thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard*" (Acts xxii. 15).

It is true that each Apostle chose for his missionary labours a special field, one going *unto the heathen*, another *unto the circumcision* (Gal. ii. 9); but as Apostles they all dealt with all members of the Churches, irrespective of their race, knowing that "*in Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Gentile*" (Gal. iii. 28).

To imagine St. Paul implying that because he was an Apostle of the Gentiles he had as such nothing to do with the Jews, is to impute to him a thought of which he was incapable, and one which is directly opposed to his own statements in various passages of this Epistle, such as i. 16, ii. 9, iii. 19. The error has in fact arisen from the very general misinterpretation of his words in xi. 13, which distinctly imply that he was *not* an Apostle of the Gentiles *only*, but that this was *one part* (*μέρος*), though doubtless the chief part, of his office: see our note on the passage, and Introduction to 1 Peter, § 3, note 3.

This same passage xi. 13 is misinterpreted in another respect by Baur, p. 332.

"The very fact that when the Apostle turns to the Gentile Christians, he makes it appear that he does so, and addresses them specially (xi. 13-24) shows that in the rest of the Epistle he had Jewish much more than Gentile Christians before his mind. The main argument being concluded, they are singled out as a part of the community, they are addressed specially (*ὑμῶν γάρ λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*, xi. 13), and thus appear as subordinate to the general body, in addressing which no special designation is required."

This bold stroke of interpretation will not bear examination.

In the first place there is no turning from a general body of readers to a portion specially singled out. The words *ὑμῶν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* do not mean, as Baur supposes, "you the Gentile part of my readers," but "you my readers

who are Gentiles": see our note on the passage, and compare Green, "Grammar of the N. T. Dialect," p. 199.

Throughout the whole section, ix.—xi., though so deeply interesting to every Jew, there is not the slightest indication that St. Paul "had Jewish more than Gentile Christians before his mind," as Baur asserts. Only once before in this section are the readers described, and then simply, as "*brethren*" (x. i.): they are distinguished throughout from the Jews, of whom he speaks "as third persons" (Meyer). He calls them "*my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh,*" not "*our brethren, our kinsmen,*" as would be natural if his readers were for the most part Jews.

Baur himself writes: "The whole section which concludes this part of the Epistle, xi. 13—36, is certainly devoted to the Gentile Christians: this is shewn by the repeated *ὑμεῖς* in vv. 28, 30, 31, and by the drift of the passage vv. 15—29, when correctly understood. But this section is of the nature of a digression, and the argument then returns to its proper object" (p. 333). This concession is fatal: for no one who has impartially studied the train of thought in ix.—xi. and the close connexion between ch. xi. and xii. 1, will be easily persuaded that xi. 13—36 is a mere digression or anything less than the grand conclusion of the whole argument upon the destiny of Israel, nor will believe that the readers addressed in the repeated *ὑμεῖς* in vv. 28, 30, 31 are only a small Gentile fraction of the whole body to whom the Apostle says in xii. 1, "*I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God:*" see the notes there.

Having now examined all the passages specially alleged by Baur as proving that the readers were for the most part Jewish Christians, we must notice more briefly a few other passages which may be supposed to support the same view.

In ii. 17—39 it is too obvious to need more than a passing remark that the Jew so sternly and sarcastically addressed cannot possibly be thought of as one of the readers; nor is there any need to dwell on Volkmar's strange notion that the passage iii. 1—8 "is a dialogue

between the Jew *in* the Jewish Christian and the man who is slandered as wishing to overthrow the Law that through this evil good may come."

In iv. 1, Abraham is called "*our father*," or "*our forefather*." Does the pronoun "*our*" imply, as is alleged, the Jewish origin of the Christians of Rome? "Yes," replies M. Godet, "if the translation were: *our father according to the flesh.*"

M. Godet accordingly has recourse to the forced and unsuitable connexion, "What shall we say that Abraham hath found according to the flesh?"—and gives to *προπάτωρ* the sense of "spiritual forefather." There is however nothing in the *immediate* context to justify such an anticipation of the spiritual fatherhood of Abraham, which first comes into notice in v. 11; and without such anticipation the supposed difficulty is not removed by the change of construction.

The very simple explanation is that the question is naturally put from the standing-point of a Jew, whether St. Paul himself or an imaginary objector is of no consequence. What else then could he say than "*our*" forefather? Speaking to Gentiles concerning the Jews in general, a Jew would say, as St. Paul says in ix. 3, "*my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh;*" but in speaking of Abraham, or of Isaac, as in ix. 16, no one Jew could separate himself from his nation and say "*my forefather Abraham,*" or "*my father Isaac.*"

Weizsäcker (*ib.* p. 259) puts the question rightly: "In i Cor. x. 1 Paul speaks of the Israelites in the wilderness, and there calls them quite in the same way '*all our fathers.*' But who would thence wish to conclude, in spite of all evidence to the contrary, that the Corinthian Church was an especially Jewish Christian one?" See our foot-note and additional note on iv. 1.

In vii. 1 the Apostle writes "*Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law) &c.*" and the parenthesis is supposed to point to Jewish readers. But Meyer's answer is complete: "Looking to the close connexion subsisting

## INTRODUCTION.

between the Jewish and Gentile-Christian portions of the Church, to the custom borrowed from the Synagogue of reading from the Old Testament in public, and to the necessary and essential relations which Evangelical instruction and preaching sustained to the O. T., so that the latter was the basis from which they started, the Apostle might designate *his readers generally* as *γνώσκοντες [τὸν] νόμον*, and predicate of them an acquaintance with the Law." This strong argument becomes even stronger, when for the A. V. we substitute the more correct rendering required by the absence of the Article before *γνώσκοντες* and *νόμον*: see foot-note on the verse.

We may add that in the case of born Jews a knowledge of the Law would have been too much a matter of course to require this special mention, which is on the other hand perfectly natural in the case of Gentile converts who had not always known the law. Thus in Galatians iv. 21, St. Paul asks, "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?" Yet who would infer from this that the Galatian Churches were of Jewish origin?

Volkmar indeed ventures to say (p. xi.) that in Rom. vii. 1 "born Hebrews are directly addressed, as the root-stem of the Church": but we may confidently reply, with Weizsäcker (p. 259) that "If anyone will lay stress upon this expression, it speaks much more in favour of Gentile than of Jewish readers."

The passage xv. 14-16 is usually and justly regarded as a clear proof that the readers addressed were for the most part Gentiles. Dr. Davidson does not admit this ('Introduction to N. T.' i. 125): "Here Paul announces himself the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, that the offering of the Gentiles might be acceptable to God. But the context does not necessarily limit the *offering of the Gentiles* to that of the *Roman Christians*, as is assumed." This objection is quite beside the mark: it is not assumed at all that the offering is limited to *Roman* Christians: but it is manifest that St. Paul justifies himself for writing boldly to the Romans on

the ground that he is a minister of Christ to the Gentiles. The conclusion is inevitable, that the readers thus addressed were Gentiles.

This passage is treated in a different way by the Tübingen critics, who represent it as an addition made by one of the Pauline party at a later period to remove or soften "the bad impression" made by the genuine Epistle upon a Jewish Christian Church which was already gaining pre-eminence over other Churches, and claiming another Apostle, St. Peter, as its founder. See Baur, 'Paulus,' pp. 355, 365. Apart, however, from this passage we have found abundant evidence in that portion of the Epistle of which the genuineness has not been questioned, to prove that the majority of the Christians at Rome, when St. Paul wrote to them, were not of Jewish but of Gentile origin: and herewith we have removed the corner-stone of Baur's own theory and many subsequent modifications of it.

Without dwelling on these various theories, we proceed to consider the several historical circumstances, which tend to throw light on the purpose of the Epistle.

In doing this we cannot limit our view, as Baur has done (p. 310), to the special circumstances and doctrinal tendencies of the readers addressed. We must look also to the position of St. Paul himself at this time in relation to Rome, to Jerusalem, to the Gentile Churches, to the whole course of his Apostolic work, and to the great questions which were at that time most intimately connected with the truth of the Gospel which he preached.

(a). It is universally admitted that there were both Jewish and Gentile Christians in the Roman Community. From evidence furnished by the Epistle we have concluded that the Jewish element was not predominant. Bp. Lightfoot, who at one time admitted "the existence of a large, perhaps preponderant, Jewish element in the Church of the Metropolis before St. Paul's arrival" ('Philippians' p. 17), seems to withdraw this opinion in a subsequent essay in the 'Journal of Philology,' 1869,

No. 4, p. 228: "St. Paul, if I mistake not, starts from the fact that the Roman Church stood on Gentile ground, and that very large and perhaps preponderating numbers of its members were Gentiles. This is his justification for writing to them, as the Apostle of the Gentiles. It never once occurs to him that he is intruding on the province of others."

If the majority of the Roman Christians were, as we believe, of Gentile origin, it may still be thought that they had been subject for the most part to Judaizing influences, and were strongly prejudiced against St. Paul. "M. Renan insists that the Roman brotherhood must have been founded and built up by emissaries from Palestine. But why should the Christianity of Rome be due to Jerusalem solely, and not also to Antioch and Corinth and Ephesus, with which cities communication must have been even more frequent? Why at Rome alone should the Judaic element be all-powerful and the Pauline insignificant?" (Bp. Lightfoot, 'Journal of Philology,' p. 289.)

There is in the whole Epistle only one short reference to false teachers (xvi. 17-20), and in this, if the persons meant were, as is assumed and that with great probability, Judaizing adversaries of St. Paul, we have a distinct proof, that the teaching hitherto prevalent in the community was not Judaistic but the contrary, in the words "*mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned.*" In our notes on the passage we follow the usual supposition that it was written, like the rest of the Epistle, before St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome: but see the concluding paragraphs of § 8.

Bleek has treated this point with great clearness and moderation in his 'Introduction to the N. T.' i. 442: "The probability is that it (Christianity) was not conveyed thither by any special or prominent teachers or missionaries sent for the purpose, but that residents in the city, Jews and Gentiles, became acquainted with it and were converted elsewhere, and upon their return made converts among their friends. This may

have been the case especially with many Jews who either were driven from Rome by the edict of Claudius, and when this edict was forgotten or revoked, returned again, or went to reside there for the first time. They may have been converted to Christianity *partly* by St. Paul's preaching, or by that of his companions or in some of the Churches planted by him, and *partly* in other places, e. g. in Jerusalem itself."

We know beyond doubt that differences of belief and practice existed in Rome as in other Churches. One class would not eat flesh nor drink wine (xiv. 2, 21) lest they should be defiled (v. 14), and also observed certain days as more holy than others (v. 5); while another class regarded all kinds of food, and all days, alike. These were inclined to despise the former as superstitious, the former to condemn them as profane (vv. 3, 10). Bp. Lightfoot thinks that the asceticism here described may possibly be due to Essene influences ('Colossians,' p. 169), while Baur asserts that the characteristics "are such as are found nowhere else but with the Ebionites." The rigid observance of the Sabbath and other holy days, and extreme simplicity in eating and drinking, were common to both Essenes and Ebionites. Baur confesses that there is no express statement that the Ebionites abstained from wine.

Of the Essenes Josephus ('Bell. Jud.' ii. 8, 5) thus writes: "When they have taken their seats quietly, the baker sets loaves before them in order, and the cook sets one dish of one kind of food before each." The word "food" (*έδαρπα*, 'pulmentum') does not exclude flesh (Plato, 'Timaeus,' 73, A), and there is no mention of abstinence from wine either here, or as we believe in any of the other notices of the Essenes by Josephus ('Vita,' 2; 'Ant.' xiii. 5, 9, xviii. 1, 5), or by Philo Judaeus ('Quod omnis probus liber,' xii., xiii.; 'Fragm. apud Euseb.' 'Praepar. Evang.' viii. 8).

There is however a description of the Therapeuta, a Jewish sect whom Philo distinguishes from the Essenes ('Vita Contempl.' iv.), which combines all the characteristic scruples mentioned by St. Paul: "They eat nothing of a costly

character, but plain bread and a seasoning of salt, which the more luxurious of them do further season with hyssop: and their drink is water from the spring."

In another passage (*ib. ix.*) he says, in describing their feasts, "wine is not introduced, but only the clearest water; cold water for the generality, and hot water for those old men who are accustomed to a luxurious life. And the table too bears nothing which has blood, but there is placed upon it bread for food and salt for seasoning, to which also hyssop is sometimes added as an extra sauce for the sake of those who are delicate in their eating."

These Therapeutae were numerous in Egypt, but were also met with in various places, in Greece and in the country of the Barbarians (*ib. iii.*).

It is thus quite clear from contemporary evidence that ascetic practices, such as St. Paul describes, were in his time common among the religious Jews, and not unlikely to be adopted by Jewish Christians: while from the tone in which St. Paul speaks of these brethren weak in faith, we may safely infer that they, *i. e.* the Jewish Christians, were a minority both in numbers and influence, whose conscientious scruples should be treated with kindness and forbearance. They did not put themselves forward "in an aggressive anti-Pauline attitude: they were men not of hostile, but only of prejudiced minds, whose moral consciousness lacked the vigour to regard a peculiar asceticism as unessential" (Meyer).

In the desire to abate the dissension between these two classes, we see a sufficient motive for one portion of the Epistle (xiv.—xv. 13), but no sufficient ground for the great doctrinal argument which precedes (i. 18—xi.). In other words the *main purpose* of the Epistle is neither a polemic against Jewish Christians nor an attempt to reconcile Jewish and Gentile believers, occasioned by the local circumstances and special tendencies of the Christian Community at Rome.

(b.) Another important point in reference to the motive of the Epistle is St. Paul's own position at this time with

regard to Rome and other Gentile Churches.

His earnest desire to visit Rome (i. 10–15, xv. 22–24) formed part of a great plan of carrying the Gospel into the distant regions of the West. It is acknowledged even by those who doubt the authenticity of Rom. xv. that the design here mentioned may well have been entertained by the Apostle, and that the mention of it is in fact an argument for the genuineness of the passage. There is no historical evidence (unless it be the much disputed and doubtful phrase, ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως Ἐλθών in the Epistle of Clement of Rome, 'Cor.' v.) that St. Paul ever visited Spain: and though it is not at all improbable that he may have entertained a purpose which he was never able to accomplish, it is in the highest degree incredible that a forger should think of *inventing* for him a design which did not correspond with any known event in his life. Compare Baur ('Paulus,' p. 180), Lucht (p. 192) Hilgenfeld (p. 486).

In this design then we find one chief cause of the Apostle's earnest desire to visit Rome. His work in the East, so far as it required his personal presence, was accomplished: he had preached the Gospel "from Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum." Jerusalem itself, Damascus, Caesarea, Tarsus, "the regions of Syria and Cilicia" (Acts ix. 19–30; Gal. i. 21; ii. 1, 2) are all naturally included in the general phrase which describes the extent of his early labours in the East, "*Jerusalem and round about.*" Quite recently he had paid a second visit to Macedonia and "*had gone over those parts*" (Acts xx. 2), passing so far to the West as to reach Illyricum, which borders upon Macedonia (Paley's 'Horae Paulinae,' Ch. ii. No. 4).

Never before had he been so near to Rome, and now that his mind was full of the great design of carrying the Gospel beyond Rome itself into those far regions of Western Europe, where Christ was not yet named (xv. 20; 2 Cor. x. 15, 16), he had the strongest motives for forming more intimate relations with the Christians at Rome,

motives quite independent of the internal condition of their Community. His keen eye could not but discern the vast importance of securing a base of operations in the Capital of the Western World. Hence in part his fervent desire to visit Rome, hence also a motive for writing this Epistle in order to secure at once the sympathy and help of his brethren there. We may admit with Bleek (p. 445) that St. Paul "discerned the great importance of the Church in such a centre, and of the tendencies which it adopted, as influencing the Church of Christ at large, and how desirable it was that the Christians there should not be disturbed and rent asunder by internal disputes and party strifes." It was natural that the Apostle, being unable at once to visit Rome, should gladly take an opportunity of sending by Phœbe "a letter containing his Apostolic instructions and exhortations" (Bleek). The reality of this motive cannot be doubted, though its importance may be exaggerated: it accounts for St. Paul's writing to Rome, though not for his writing so remarkable an Epistle: we cannot, with Schott, find here the key to unlock the whole meaning and purpose of the Epistle.

(c.) Another historical circumstance mentioned in the Epistle is St. Paul's intended journey to Jerusalem: when this intention is first announced at Ephesus (Acts xix. 21) it is connected with the desire to visit Rome. What then was the motive which urged the Apostle, in spite of warnings and prophecies and his own forebodings of danger (Acts xx. 22, 23, 28; xxi. 4, 11-14), to persist in his resolution to go up to Jerusalem? It was evidently the desire to vindicate himself against the calumnies of the Judaizing adversaries who had so maliciously assailed his character, denied his Apostolic authority, and hindered his work in the Churches of Corinth and Galatia. These adversaries were not Jewish Christians of the ordinary type, much less were they the authorised agents of the original Apostles: they were the same bigoted and uncompromising partisans of the circumcision, of whom we read at an earlier period

(Acts xi. 2, 3) that they contended with Peter, "saying, *Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them.*" And was there not cause for St. Paul to fear that these bitter enemies would stir up strife in Rome and try to frustrate his labour in the West, as they had already in the East? This fear would be most naturally suggested by the Apostle's very recent experience at Corinth. There he had won a hard victory over those "overgreat Apostles" (2 Cor. xi. 5; xii. 11) who were nothing else than "*false Apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into (the) Apostles of Christ*" (2 Cor. xi. 13): their slanders had reached the ears of the many thousands of Jewish believers in Jerusalem: they might even raise a prejudice against him in the minds of the true Apostles, and of James and the elders of the Church. His personal presence and report of what "*God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry*," supported by the testimony of the faithful brethren who accompanied him, and by the substantial proof which they carried with them of the goodwill of the Gentile Churches towards the poor Saints at Jerusalem, would remove the unjust suspicions of Jewish converts assembled from all parts for the feast at Jerusalem, and win fresh confidence and sympathy for the Apostle himself in entering upon his new sphere of missionary work in Western Europe. If such were the Apostle's motives for undertaking the perilous journey to Jerusalem, it can hardly be doubted that this Epistle, written at the same time, was due, in part at least, to the same desire to repel the false accusations of Judaizing opponents, to conciliate the goodwill of Jewish Christians in general, and to promote in Rome and elsewhere a closer union between Jewish and Gentile believers.

(d.) But when we examine the record of St. Paul's life at this period, we find that his most dangerous and deadly enemies were not Jewish Christians, nor even Judaizing teachers, but *unbelieving Jews*.

In the terrible catalogue of sufferings written a few months before his Epistle

## INTRODUCTION.

to the Romans, he tells of perils *by his own countrymen*, as well as by Heathen and false brethren; he tells also how *of the Jews* five times he had received forty stripes save one (2 Cor. xi.). If we turn to St. Luke's narrative we find the Apostle in Ephesus sparing no effort, shrinking from no danger, in preaching to *his brethren according to the flesh* and "persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God." Driven after three months from the Synagogue in which, as Dr. Farrar ingeniously conjectures, some of those five scourgings had been patiently endured, he still continued by the space of two years preaching *both to Jews and Greeks* the word of the Lord Jesus (Acts xix. 8-10).

Again, within a few weeks after writing to the Romans, he reminds the Ephesian elders at Miletus of temptations which, as they knew, had befallen him "*by the lying in wait of the Jews.*" In Jerusalem itself the "*bonds and afflictions*" which awaited him (xx. 23) came, as had been foreseen, not from Judaizing Christians but from fanatic "*Jews which were of Asia*" (xxi. 11, 27).

It is evident that dissensions within the Churches between Jewish and Gentile Christians were but a faint reflection of the bitter and unceasing enmity with which St. Paul was pursued by the unbelieving Jews: and thus it is in the great conflict between "*the Jews' religion*" and the Gospel of Christ, that we find the true cause and purpose of that great doctrinal treatise (i. 18—xi.), which forms the main subject of the Epistle, well described by Baur as "*the relation of Judaism and Heathenism to each other, and of both to Christianity.*"

If then we remember the distinction formerly noticed between the *occasion* of writing, and the *main purpose* of the Epistle, the former may be referred to the personal circumstances of the Apostle, and his relation to the Christian Community at Rome; while in the local circumstances and special tendencies of that community we may discover both the *occasion* and *purpose* of certain subordinate portions of the letter

(i. 1-16, xii.—xv.) but as the *main purpose* of the whole Epistle we can acknowledge nothing less comprehensive than the desire of the Apostle, at a momentous crisis in his own life's work and in the history of the whole Church of Christ, to set forth a full and systematic statement of those fundamental principles of the Gospel, which render it the one true religion for all the nations of the earth, and meet especially those deepest wants of human nature, which Judaism could not satisfy, righteousness in the sight of God, and deliverance from the power of sin and death.

In chapters ix.—xi. we have no mere historical appendix or corollary, but an intensely earnest and practical application of the principles previously discussed to the great religious difficulty of the time, the rejection of the Gospel by the mass of the Jewish nation, and the acceptance of the Gentiles in their place as the chosen people of God.

## § 8. INTEGRITY OF THE EPISTLE.

Under this head we have to consider two questions which depend in part on the same evidence: Is the doxology (xvi. 25-27) genuine? Do chapters xv. and xvi. belong wholly, or in part, or not at all to this Epistle?

The origin and nature of these questions will be best explained, if we begin with the testimony of the early fathers.

I. TERTULLIAN, writing A.D. 207-210 against Marcion's "*Antitheses*," or Contradictions between the Old and New Testaments, says (*adv. Marc.* v. 13): "What great gaps Marcion made especially in this Epistle (to the Romans) by expunging whatever he would, will be clear from the unmutilated text of our own copy. Some passages however, which ought according to his plan to have been expunged, he overlooked: and it is enough for my purpose to accept these as instances of his negligence and blindness."

In his subsequent argument Tertullian quotes no passage from chapters xv.—xvi., and refers to xiv. 10-13 as being at the close of the Epistle ("in

clausulâ"): but as he uses only such passages as Marcion had retained, this only tends to prove that the last chapters were wanting, not in his own copy, but in Marcion's.

In the treatise on Baptism, ch. xvii., Tertullian refers to the 'Acts of Paul and Thecla': now in that fiction there is frequent mention of a certain Tryphaena, who though living at Antioch in Syria is evidently connected with Rome, being called the kinswoman of Cæsar. There can be little doubt that this name Tryphaena has been taken, like other names in the same work, Onesiphorus, Demas, and Hermogenes, from St. Paul's Epistles. Hence it follows that Rom. xvi. was known, if not to Tertullian himself, at least to an earlier writer whom he quotes.

It must however be admitted that in Tertullian's other works no clear reference to these chapters has been found, though all the other chapters are frequently quoted.

The case is the same with IRENÆUS and CYPRIAN, except that Cyprian fails also to quote from Rom. iv.

But this argument from silence is worthless, as may be easily shown from the parallel case of 1 Cor. xvi.

Cyprian quotes from every other chapter, about 101 times in all; Irenæus quotes every other chapter except xiv., about seventy-seven times in all: yet neither Irenæus nor Cyprian appears to have ever quoted 1 Cor. xvi. Tertullian, in his work against Marcion, quotes every other chapter of 1 Cor., 129 times in all, yet never refers to ch. xvi.: in his other works there are more than 300 quotations from the Epistle, including every chapter except xvi., from which there is possibly one quotation, though we have failed to verify Tischendorf's reference 'Pudicitia', 14.

When therefore Lucht concludes from this silence that it is *possible* that Tertullian, Cyprian, and Irenæus had no knowledge of Rom. xv., xvi., we may reply, It is equally *possible* and neither more nor less *probable*, as far as this silence is concerned, that the same fathers had no knowledge of 1 Cor. xvi.

A more *probable* explanation is that

Irenæus and Cyprian, using only such passages as suited their own immediate purpose, like Tertullian in his treatise against Marcion, found no occasion to refer to Rom. xv., xvi. In fact these chapters, like 1 Cor. xvi., are in great measure made up of personal matters interesting chiefly to the Apostle and his immediate correspondents at Rome.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA quotes passages from both chapters frequently, and describes them as belonging to the Epistle to the Romans, without the least apparent consciousness that this could possibly be doubted.

ORIGEN. A most important though much disputed testimony to the genuineness of these chapters is found in Origen's Commentary upon the Epistle ('Opera,' tom. vii. p. 453, Lommatzsch; tom. iv. p. 687, ed. Ben.). After quoting the Doxology (xvi. 25-27) in its usual place at the end of the Epistle, Origen proceeds :

"Marcion, who tampered with the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles, entirely took away this paragraph; and not this only, but also from that place where it is written, *Whatsoever is not of faith is sin* (xiv. 23), right on to the end, he cut all away (*cuncta dissecuit*). But in other copies, that is, in those which have not been corrupted by Marcion, we find this very paragraph differently placed. For in some manuscripts after the passage above mentioned, *Whatsoever is not of faith is sin*, there follows in immediate connexion (*statim cohaerens*), *Now unto him that is of power to stablish you*: but other manuscripts have it at the end, as it is now placed."

This passage from Origen does not prove, as some have inferred, that Marcion regarded the Doxology in particular as spurious, nor that he appealed to earlier MSS. as omitting it, nor that Origen found it omitted in any other MSS. besides those which had been mutilated by Marcion.

It does prove that Origen knew of copies corrupted by Marcion, which omitted all after the last verse of ch. xiv.

It implies that, *as far as Origen knew*, (Lucht, p. 39) no other MSS. omitted the

## INTRODUCTION.

Doxology, but some placed it between xiv. and xv.

Thus we have evidence of a *diversity of position* before Origen's time, and regarded by him as independent of Marcion's mutilated copies. But we have no evidence of *omission* before Marcion, who was at Rome propagating his views about A.D. 138–140. He *probably* disliked St. Paul's statements concerning the use of the Old Testament in xv. 4, 8, and *possibly* may have found an existing *diversity of position* to afford a pretext for his *omission* of xv., xvi.

We may further observe that when Marcion is said to have expunged and cut away ('abstulit,' 'dissecuit') the two chapters and the Doxology, it is clearly implied that these were genuine portions of St. Paul's Epistle *omitted first by Marcion*.

That this was the opinion of Origen himself, not merely of his translator Rufinus, is admitted and proved by Lucht himself (p. 36): and Origen's judgment may well be preferred to Lucht's baseless conjecture (adopted from Baur, 'Paulus,' p. 350) that Marcion may have omitted the two chapters because they were not written by St. Paul, but added by a forger (Lucht, p. 41).

II. From the testimony of the early fathers we pass to that of the existing MSS.

(a) Chapters xv., xvi. are not omitted in any known MS.

(b) The Doxology (xvi. 25–27) is variously placed, repeated, or omitted.

(1) It is placed at the end of xvi., and only there, in Ι, B, C, D, E, f, Vulg., Syriac (Schaaf), Memph., Aeth., and the Latin fathers. The cursive MS. 66 after the ἀμήν of v. 24 puts τέλος, to mark the end of the Epistle, but then adds the Doxology, and has in the margin this note: "In the ancient copies the end of the Epistle is here (*i. e.* after the Apostolic benediction, *v.* 24), but the rest (*i. e.* the Doxology) is found at the end of the 14th chapter."

(2) It is found at the end of xiv., and there only, in L, most cursives, the Greek lectionaries, Syr. (Harclean), and Greek Commentators, except Origen.

(3) It is found in both places in A, P, 17, Arm.

(4) It is omitted in both places in F, G; but in F a blank space is left in the Greek after xvi. 24, and the corresponding space in the Latin (f) is occupied by the Doxology; while in G a blank space is left in the Greek, and consequently in the interlinear Latin, between xiv. and xv.

(c) In many manuscripts of the Latin Bible, especially codex Amiatinus, and Fuldensis, both of the 6th century, there is a division into sections (*capitulatio*) marked by numbers in the text, and a prefixed table of contents with corresponding numbers, in which the subject of each section is briefly described.

The 50th section in the Codex Amiatinus "On the peril of one who grieves his brother by his meat," corresponds with xiv. 15–23: But the next and last section, "On the mystery of the Lord kept secret before His passion, but after His passion revealed," answers to nothing else in the remainder of the Epistle except the Doxology. It is therefore a natural conclusion that this capitulation was first adapted to a Latin MS. in which the Doxology was placed immediately after xiv. 23 and xv., xvi. omitted. On these capitulations see Bp. Lightfoot, 'Journal of Philology,' 1871, No. 6, pp. 196–203.

(d) In one MS. (G) all mention of Rome in the Epistle is wanting.

In i. 7 for τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν 'Ρώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς Θεοῦ, we find in G, τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ, the Latin (g) corresponding.

In i. 15 the words τοῖς ἐν 'Ρώμῃ are omitted in G and g.

One cursive manuscript (47) has a marginal note that some one, apparently an ancient commentator, "makes no mention of the words ἐν 'Ρώμῃ either in the interpretation or in the text."

In this evidence "the statement of Origen respecting Marcion (confirmed by the incidental expression of Tertullian), the absence of quotations in several early fathers, and the capitulation (or capitulations) of the Latin Bibles," Bp. Lightfoot writes, "we have testimony various, cumulative, and (as it seems to me) irresistible, to the existence

of shorter copies of the Epistle, containing only fourteen chapters with or without the doxology, in early times."

"The theory, by which I sought to combine and explain these facts, was this; that St. Paul at a later period of his life re-issued the Epistle in a shorter form with a view to general circulation, omitting the last two chapters, obliterating the mention of Rome in the first chapter, and adding the Doxology, which was no part of the original Epistle" ('Journal of Ph.' 1871, No. 6, p. 203).

The theory was subjected to a friendly but keen and searching criticism by Professor Hort ('Journal of Ph.' 1870, No. 5), and defended in the following number by Bp. Lightfoot.

It is almost needless to say that the views of both writers are set forth with consummate skill, and the three papers are of great and permanent value to every student of the Epistle.

Professor Hort tries to prove, but as we venture to think unsuccessfully, that Marcion (as represented by Origen in the original reading of his comment) omitted only the Doxology, and not the two whole chapters: he attaches no great importance to the absence of quotations in Tertullian, Irenæus, and Cyprian: and thinks that the Doxology may have been transferred from the end of the Epistle to the position which it now holds in some Greek MSS., after xiv. 23, because chapters xv., xvi. were not much used in the Church lessons, "and yet some Church, for instance that of Alexandria, may have been glad to rescue the striking Doxology at the end for congregational use by adding it to some neighbouring lesson . . . Scribes accustomed to hear it in that connexion in the public lessons would half mechanically introduce it into the text of St. Paul (*i. e.* after xiv. 23) . . . Then in the course of time it would be seen that St. Paul was not likely to have written the Doxology twice over in the same epistle, and it would be struck out in one place or the other" (p. 72).

This alternative hypothesis is rejected by Bp. Lightfoot as "devoid alike of evidence and probability." He maintains that the capitulation of the codex

Amiatinus has no trace of being intended for lectionary use (p. 202), that it was framed originally for a short copy of the Old Latin, yet maintained its ground as a common mode of dividing the Epistle, until it was at length superseded by the present division into sixteen chapters in the latter half of the 13th century."

Bp. Lightfoot upholds his theory simply as "the most probable explanation of the facts, until a better is suggested" (p. 194): and it is certainly less difficult to suppose that St. Paul himself at a later period of his life adapted the letter in a shortened form to general circulation (p. 214), than to accept M. Renan's complicated theory of four or five original editions addressed to different Churches, all at last brought together and compounded into our present Epistle.

But even this hypothesis of a shorter recension issued by the Apostle himself, put forth at first by Rückert and since so ably advocated by Bp. Lightfoot, seems to involve some serious difficulties.

(1) The capitulations are supposed to have been formed originally from a Latin copy of the Epistle ending with ch. xiv.: yet no other trace whatever of such an abbreviated Latin codex now exists.

(2) If the abbreviated recension were made by St. Paul himself, and the Doxology added to it, and this at Rome, as Bp. Lightfoot suggests (p. 214), it is strange and almost unaccountable that no copy of this genuine abbreviated recension has been preserved, and that no known Latin codex contains the slightest trace of the position of the Doxology after xiv. 23. The blank space in the Latin, corresponding to that in the Greek of G proves nothing, as the Latin is interlinear.

(3) The assumption that the Doxology was originally placed after ch. xiv., and thence transferred to the end of the Epistle, is opposed to the evidence of the primary Uncials, A, B, C, of Origen's express statement concerning Marcion, of all Latin MSS., and of the Latin fathers; these all agree in placing the Doxology at the end of the Epistle, and there only.

(4) When St. Paul is represented as

## INTRODUCTION.

converting his original Epistle to a new purpose by "omitting the last two chapters, obliterating the mention of Rome in the first chapter, and adding the Doxology," the process seems hardly in keeping with the truthful simplicity of the Apostle's character. There is truth in what Meyer says on this point: "Rückert's conjecture, that Paul himself may have caused copies without the local address to be sent to other Churches, assumes a mechanical arrangement in Apostolic authorship, of which there is elsewhere no trace, and which seems even opposed by Col. iv. 16."

(5) Bp. Lightfoot suggests (p. 213) that Marcion, who is known to have resided for many years in Rome, may have fallen in with a copy of the short Recension, and welcomed it gladly.

When we take into consideration Origen's express statement that *Marcion himself expunged and cut away the last two chapters*, it seems much more probable that the incomplete documents, from which the Capitulations were framed, were nothing else than copies of Marcion's own mutilated text, with the Doxology added. A mutilated Recension, known to be the work of an arch-heretic, was much more likely to have disappeared altogether, than an abbreviated Recension known as the genuine work of St. Paul himself.

(6) If, as Origen states, Marcion mutilated the Epistle by cutting off chapters xv., xvi. entirely, he would have a motive for removing *ἐν Πόμη* also in i. 7, 15: for a letter addressed by St. Paul to the Christians at Rome, in whom he was so deeply interested, could not possibly end so abruptly as at xiv. 23, without a single allusion to his own personal state or theirs, without a single greeting, without even his usual Apostolic Benediction. Marcion therefore is much more likely than St. Paul to have obliterated the mention of Rome in the 1st chapter.

Another possible explanation is suggested by Meyer, that "perhaps some Church, which received a copy of the Epistle from the Romans for public reading, may for their own particular Church-use have deleted the extraneous

designation of place, and thus individual codices may have passed into circulation without it." Volkmar adopts a similar explanation (p. 74).

But on this supposition we should expect to find some of the Lectionaries omitting the words, whereas they all, apparently, contain them.

On the whole we cannot but admit the force of Lucht's conclusion (pp. 65, f.) that if the Doxology was written by St. Paul himself, its original place must have been at the end of the Epistle, and not after xiv. 23.

(c) The Benedictions. According to the received Text there are three concluding formulæ, the Apostolic Benediction at xvi. 20 (*ἡ χάρις κ. τ. λ.*), the same Benediction repeated at xvi. 24, and the Doxology.

The Benediction at xvi. 20 is undoubtedly genuine, being omitted only in those MSS. (D F G) which also omit the Doxology at the end, and leave the Benediction at xvi. 24 as the conclusion of the Epistle, the motive of these changes evidently being to reduce the Epistle to the accustomed form.

The Benediction at xvi. 24 is omitted in the chief uncials (A B C), in Amiat. Ful. and other MSS. of the Vulgate, in the Coptic and Aethiopic Versions, and in Origen.

It is found in this place in D, F, G, L, 37, 47, the Vulgate (Demid. Tol. and other codices), the Syriac (Harclean), and the Gothic, and in most of the Greek Commentators. It is put after the Doxology in P, 17, Syriac (Schaai), Arm. Aeth.

Upon this evidence the Benediction at xvi. 24 is rejected by Lachmann, Tregelles, and in his last edition (8) by Tischendorf. Bp. Lightfoot, and Professor Hort reject it, but it is retained by Meyer, Fritzsche, Lange, Hofmann, Lucht (p. 82), Hilgenfeld ('Einleit.' p. 326), Reuss, Volkmar, as well as by older interpreters generally. The question therefore of its genuineness must be regarded as still under discussion.

Our own belief is that the Benediction is genuine in both places, and that in v. 20 it forms the conclusion of a later letter to the Church at Rome, of which

the fragment *vv. 3-20* became incorporated with Romans. We thus account at once for the seeming repetition of the Benediction at *v. 24*, and also see a motive for its omission there in so many good MSS, there being no other example of such repetition.

### III. INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

(a.) *The Doxology.* Objections to the genuineness of the Doxology drawn from its special character are directed either against its form, its phraseology, or its ideas.

(1) *The Form.* It is alleged that the beginning and the end (*τῷ δὲ δυναμέω ἡμᾶς στηρίξαι . . . μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, φ. ἡ δόξα κ. τ. λ.) show that there is a mixture of two different forms of Doxology. The whole difficulty lies in the superfluous Relative (φ.), and its position. This relative is omitted in the Vatican Codex and two cursives (33, 72), in f, the Latin of F, in Schaf's Syriac, and by Origen (or Rufinus) in his commentary on the passage. Dr. Hort ('Journal of Philol.' No. 5, p. 57) thinks that "φ. is probably an intrusion, notwithstanding the presumption in favour of an irregular construction." Godet thinks that when St. Paul began the sentence, he did not mean it to end thus—"to him be glory"—but with some such thought as—"to him I commend you" (*συνιστῆμι ἡμᾶς*, Glöckler).

He adds "We give glory to him who *has done* the work; but in regard to him who *is able* to do it, we look to him to do it, we claim his help, we express our confidence in him and in his power." But this reasoning is at once refuted by a glance at Eph. iii. 20, *τῷ δὲ δυναμέω . . . αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα κ. τ. λ.*

Meyer joins διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ with σοφῷ, "God who through Jesus Christ has shown himself the only wise," the object of this harsh connexion being to avoid the supposed necessity of referring φ. to the person last named, Jesus Christ, and so ascribing the glory to Him. This necessity is neither more nor less than in Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 11, where see the notes.

Ewald translates as if the order were

φ. διὰ Ἰ. Χ. ἡ δόξα, and supposes this natural order to have been changed for the sake of throwing an emphasis on "through Jesus Christ."

We can accept his translation as rightly expressing what St. Paul meant, but not his explanation of the unusual order, which is the main difficulty.

Upon the whole we are disposed to agree with Dr. Hort that "φ. is probably an intrusion," though of a very early date. We must admit that with so great a preponderance of external authority φ. ought to be retained in the text now, whatever may have been its origin. But on the other hand the authorities for the omission are varied and of considerable value: while the intrusion might very easily have been caused by the presence of φ. in the parallel passages Gal. i. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 11. Rückert rejects φ., and Reiche, in his Critical Commentary, concludes that the writer of the Doxology borrowed it from Heb. xiii. 21 or Jude 25.

The objection that St. Paul does not end his Epistles with a Doxology comes with little force from those who, like Baur and Lucht, count only three Epistles, besides Romans, to be genuine.

That the last clause of the Doxology is characteristic of St. Paul is seen in its close resemblance to xi. 36; Gal. i. 5; and its difference from 1 Pet. iv. 11; v. 11.

When Lucht urges that Doxologies forming long and complete sentences are not found in St. Paul's Epistles, but only in Eph. iii. 20, 21; Phil. iv. 20; 1 Tim. i. 17; 2 Pet. iii. 18; Jude 24, 25; we can only reply that the three Epistles first named are to us St. Paul's, and as such they help by their many points of resemblance to the Doxology in Romans to confirm its genuineness.

Other objections to the length of the Doxology, to its numerous intermediate clauses, and to the mixture of strong emotion with profound doctrinal statements, are refuted by a due appreciation of the peculiar character of the Epistle. "The whole Epistle could hardly have a fitter close than a Doxology embodying the faith from which its central chapters proceed" (Hort, p. 56).

"The leading ideas contained in the whole Epistle, as they had already found in the introduction (i. 1-7) their preluding key-note, and again in xi. 33 ff., their preliminary doxological expression, now further receive, in the fullest unison of inspired piety, their concentrated outburst for the true final consecration of the whole" (Meyer).

(2) *Diction.* Lucht acknowledges that every single expression in the Doxology (except *σεσιγμένον*) may be found in St. Paul's genuine Epistles, by which he means Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians.

The Passive *σιγάσθαι* is found nowhere else in the N. T. or LXX: but St. Paul's use of *σεσιγμένον* is fully justified by such passages as Eurip. 'Iphigenia in Tauris,' 1076, πάντα σιγηθῆσται, Pindar, Ol. ix. 156, *σεσιγμένον οὐ σκαύτερον χρῆμ' ἔκαστον*, and many others.

The objection that the several words and phrases of the Doxology, though found in the four great Epistles, are there used only in other meanings or connexions, will for most readers be sufficiently answered by Lucht's further objection, that the Doxology in all these points agrees with what he calls non-Pauline writings, the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, Timothy, and Titus.

These points of agreement are indicated in our foot-notes: and it is only necessary to add that the expression "everlasting God" (*αἰώνιος Θεός*), to which Lucht objects, is fully justified by the usage of the LXX not only in Job xxxiii. 12, *αἰώνιος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἐπάνω βροτῶν*, but also in the very striking passage Gen. xxi. 33, *ἐπεκαλέσατο ἐπὶ τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου, Θεὸς αἰώνιος*. Here "Jehovah is called the everlasting God as the eternally true, with respect to the eternal covenant which He established with Abraham xvii. 7" (Keil & Delitzsch). So remarkable a title must have been familiar to St. Paul, and its use here in reference to the same eternal covenant is so appropriate that the supposed objection is really a strong argument for St. Paul's authorship.

(3) *Ideas.*—Lucht's attempt to prove

that the Doxology has a Gnostic tendency, and must therefore be of a post-Apostolic date, is rightly dismissed by Meyer as based only upon misinterpretation and a pre-supposition that all except the four greater Epistles of St. Paul are spurious.

(b.) *Chapters xv., xvi.* The objections brought by Baur, and the extreme partisans of his School, against the genuineness of these two whole chapters can have little weight except for those who accept his general theory of the purpose of the Epistle, which we have already examined in § 7 and found untenable. Assuming the preponderance at Rome of a Judaizing party to whom the earlier portion of the Epistle would have been distasteful, Baur sees in the last two chapters the work of a later "Paulinist writing in the spirit of the Acts of the Apostles, seeking to soothe the Judaists, and to promote the cause of unity, and therefore tempering the keen anti-Judaism of Paul with a milder and more conciliatory conclusion to his Epistle" ('Paulus,' i. p. 365).

Lucht, less bold than Baur, does not venture to treat the two chapters as wholly spurious: admitting that the original Epistle could not have ended at xiv. 23, he thinks that portions of the genuine conclusion are still to be found in chapters xv. and xvi. His theory is that the Roman clergy, fearing lest offence might be given by the Apostle's treatment of ascetic scruples as "*the infirmities of the weak*" (xv. i.), withheld the conclusion of the letter from public use, and laid it up in their archives together with a letter to the Ephesians which by mistake had been brought to Rome; and that these genuine Pauline materials were worked up by a later writer into the present form of the last two chapters.

According to Volkmar (pp. 129-132) the latter part of the genuine letter was either lost or purposely suppressed, and in the 2nd Century two attempts were made to supply a fitting conclusion to xiv. 23: in the Eastern Church the Doxology was added (xvi. 25-27), in the Western Church the greater part of the last two chapters, namely xv. 1-32, xvi.

3-16, and 17-20. Afterwards both additions were combined in various ways, and under this "Catholic conglomerate" of conciliatory matter lay the genuine conclusion long hidden, yet accurately preserved in two passages xv. 33—xvi. 2, and xvi. 21-24.

To all these arbitrary hypotheses we may apply the remark of Hilgenfeld ('Einleitung,' p. 323): "What is here regarded as un-Pauline only shews, according to my conviction, that since Marcion's time there has been a one-sided picture of St. Paul, to which some still desire to make the true Paul correspond." Compare in this Commentary the Introduction to 1 Peter, § 3.

As regards the xvth Chapter we may confidently say that the result of modern criticism has been to prove beyond reasonable doubt that it is both the genuine work of St. Paul and an original portion of the Roman Epistle. "It is undeniable that xv. 1-13 belongs to xiv. and that xv. 14-33 forms the conclusion of the Epistle" (De Wette, 'Kurze Erklärung,' p. 204). Pfleiderer ('Paulinism,' ii. 41, note) expressly maintains with Hilgenfeld, "in spite of Baur, Lucht, and Lipsius," that the chapter is genuine. The opposite opinion has now few advocates even in Germany.

In regard to Chapter xvi. the case is rather different. According to the conjecture of Schulz, adopted by Ewald, Renan, Reuss, Farrar and others, the greater part of the chapter belonged to a genuine letter of St. Paul addressed, not to Rome, but to Ephesus.

In considering this theory it will be convenient to examine each portion of the chapter separately.

#### *vv. 1, 2. The Commendation of Phœbe.*

It is objected that St. Paul could not have written this commendation of Phœbe to a distant Church, because he had shortly before expressed a disparaging opinion of commendatory letters (2 Cor. iii. 1). But if the Apostle in vindicating his authority asserts that he has no need of "*epistles of commendation*," it by no means follows that he thought them unnecessary for all persons. A woman

undertaking a journey to a distant city might well need to be commended to the care of the Christian community, especially if she was (as is generally supposed) the bearer of the Apostle's own Epistle: compare the commendation of Timothy in 1 Cor. xvi. 10, 11.

Another objection is brought against the description of Phœbe as being "*a servant (διάκονος) of the church which is at Cenchreæ,*" on the ground that the office of "deaconess" was of later origin. The objection would have had some force if the title (*διακόνωσσα*), which was of later origin, had been used. We read in 1 Cor. xvi. 15 that the household of Stephanas had devoted themselves to the ministry of the saints (*έταξαν ταῦτα εἰς διάκονια τοῖς ἀγίοις*): and such self-dedication to a special work, though quite consistent with a formal designation to the office, would even without it have been sufficient to justify the application of the general term *διάκονος* as descriptive of Phœbe in her work at Cenchreæ. See our note on the passage.

In whatever way Phœbe had been "*a succourer (προστάτης) of many,*" and of St. Paul himself also, there is nothing in such service inconsistent with his frequent assertions that he had not accepted any maintenance from the Churches of Achaia, for these assertions are all of an earlier date (1 Cor. ix. 15-18; 2 Cor. xi. 7-12; xii. 13-18).

For the opinion that this commendation was addressed to the Church of Ephesus, not to Rome, we can discover no reason at all: the suggestion that from Cenchreæ she would be sailing towards Ephesus and away from Rome is sufficiently answered by saying that she may have been sailing not from Cenchreæ, but from Lechaeum, the port on the Corinthian Gulf, and in that case would pass through Corinth on her way. Legal business would be more likely to take her to Rome than to any other city.

#### *vv. 3-5 Salutation sent to Aquila and Priscilla.*

We learn from Acts xviii. 1, 2 that these persons being Jews of Pontus were driven from Rome by the edict of

## INTRODUCTION.

Claudius (A.D. 52); they were joined by St. Paul at Corinth, and thence sailed with him to Ephesus in the spring of the year 54, where they remained (Acts xviii. 19), and established "*a church in their house*" (1 Cor. xvi. 19). From Ephesus they sent a salutation to Corinth in St. Paul's 1st Epistle about April A.D. 57. Ten or twelve months later St. Paul, according to Rom. xvi. 3, sends a salutation to them "*and to the church that is in their house*" at Rome. In answer to M. Renan's objection that this would assign to them "too nomadic a life," Bp. Lightfoot asks with good reason, "Is there any real difficulty in supposing that they returned to Rome in this interval of a year more or less, and that St. Paul should have been made acquainted with their return, seeing that his own travels meanwhile had lain mainly on the route between Ephesus and Rome" ('Journal of Philology,' 1869, p. 276). In answer to the further objection that Aquila and Priscilla appear again at Ephesus (2 Tim. iv. 19) the Bishop asks with equally good reason, "Is it at all improbable that after an interval of nearly ten (eight?) years they should again revisit this important city? They were wanderers not only by the exigencies of their trade, but also by the obligations of their missionary work" ('J. of Phil.' p. 277).

So far as the internal character of the passage is concerned it might have been addressed either to the Church of Ephesus or to Rome: in favour of the latter destination a *prima facie* presumption is raised by its appearance in the Epistle to the Romans. It contains no indication of the time at which it was written.

v. 5 b. It does not follow from the description of Epaenetus as "*the first-fruits of Asia unto Christ*" that this greeting was sent to him in Asia, i.e. in Ephesus. Being named in immediate connexion with Aquila and Priscilla it is very probable that he, like Apollos, had been instructed by them and had attached himself to their company, whether at Ephesus or at Rome.

Of the 22 other persons named in vv. 6-15 not one can be shewn to have been at Ephesus, but it is assumed that only

at Ephesus could St. Paul have had so many friends as are here saluted. Against this assumption we have to set several unquestionable facts.

(1) "Urbanus, Rufus, Ampliatus, Julia and Junia are specifically Roman names" (Lucht, p. 137).

(2) Besides the first four of these names ten others, Stachys, Apelles, Tryphaena, Tryphosa, Hermes, Hermas, Patrobas (or Patrobius), Philologus, Julia, Nereus, are found in the sepulchral inscriptions on the Appian way as the names of persons connected with "Caesar's household" (Phil. iv. 22) and contemporary with St. Paul. Bp. Lightfoot in his most interesting essay on the passage has pointed out that while some of these names are too common to afford any safe ground for identifying the persons, others (Stachys, Tryphaena, Patrobas, Philologus, Nereus) are comparatively rare, and yet are found on the monuments of the imperial household at this period. The household of Aristobulus and the household of Narcissus could be only at Rome. "A combination such as Philologus and Julia," writes Bp. Lightfoot, "affords [more] solid ground for inference: and in other cases, as in the household of Narcissus, the probable circumstances suggest a connexion with the palace. If so, an explanation has been found of the reference to members of Caesar's household in the Philippian letter. At all events this investigation will not have been useless, if it has shewn that the names and allusions at the close of the Roman Epistle are in keeping with the circumstances of the Metropolis in St. Paul's day: for thus it will have supplied an answer to two forms of objection; the one denying the genuineness of the last two chapters of this letter, and the other allowing their genuineness, but detaching the salutations from the rest and assigning them to another epistle."

The answer seems to be conclusive both as to the genuineness of the salutations, and as to the place to which they were addressed, namely, Rome and not Ephesus.

But it does not remove what is after all the chief difficulty of the chapter, that at the time of writing his Epistle to

the Romans, St. Paul cannot easily be supposed to have had such an intimate knowledge of so many of the Christians at Rome. In the 'Journal of Philology,' 1869, No. 4, p. 274, Bishop Lightfoot, in reply to M. Renan, has suggested another explanation: "Will not a man studiously refrain from mentioning individual names where he is addressing a large circle of friends, feeling that it is invidious to single out some for special mention, where an exhaustive list is impossible? On the other hand, where only a limited number are known to him, he can name all, and no offence is given." In support of this explanation, it is urged that in other Epistles of St. Paul the number of names mentioned is in inverse proportion to his familiarity with the church to which he is writing: to Corinth, Thessalonica, and Philippi no salutations properly so called are addressed. "On the other hand, in the Epistle to the Colossians, whom the Apostle had never visited, certain persons are saluted by name." When we turn, however, to Colossians, we find only one salutation properly so called, i.e. addressed to a particular person by name: "*Nymphas and the church which is in his house.*" The example is therefore no parallel to the Roman salutations in which, including Aquila and Priscilla, twenty-four persons are saluted by name, besides several households.

This serious difficulty, and some others, are wholly removed, if, as we believe, the whole passage xvi. 3-20, belonged originally to a second letter addressed by St. Paul to the Roman Church *after his release from his first imprisonment at Rome*. On that supposition, the unusual number of salutations is at once explained, and the indications of intimate personal knowledge of so many members of the Church, some of whom seem to have belonged to "Caesar's household," not only raise no difficulty, but become the strongest proofs of a genuine letter.

In that case, Aquila and Priscilla may well be thought to have either preceded or followed St. Paul to Rome, and there to have alleviated his wearisome im-

prisonment, and even risked their lives for his sake

Andronicus and Junia (v. 7), being as kinsmen of St. Paul, Jews by birth, well known to the other Apostles, and "in Christ" before St. Paul himself, must have been converted elsewhere than in Rome, most probably in Jerusalem. But when were they fellow-prisoners of St. Paul? If this description was written before his first imprisonment at Rome, we are left to conjecture that they may have shared some one of his many imprisonments, of which nothing more is known. But how much more forcible and appropriate is the description, if after his release and departure from Rome, he sent this salutation to two of those who had been his fellow-captives there. The word itself (*συναχμαλώτους*) confirms the conjecture, for it is used nowhere else in the N.T., except concerning Aristarchus (Col. iv. 10), and Epaphras (Philem. 23), both of whom were Paul's *fellow-captives in Rome*.

It has been thought a difficulty that none of the persons named in rr. 3-16, are mentioned in the Epistles written from Rome during the first imprisonment. "How is it" (asks Dr. Farrar), "that not one of these exemplary twenty-six are among the three Jewish friends who are alone faithful to him, even before the Neronian persecutions began, and only a few years after this letter was despatched (Col. iv. 10, 11)?"

The answer is easy, if the passage (rr. 3-16), was addressed to Rome *after the first imprisonment*. For in Philippians, the salutations are only general: "The brethren which are with me greet you. All the saints salute you, chiefly they that are of Caesar's household" (iv. 21, 22); in Colossians and Philemon, the persons named as sending salutations are St. Paul's companions and fellow-labourers, and there is not the slightest reason to believe that any one of them was a permanent inhabitant of Rome. It was not likely, therefore, that St. Paul, writing from a distance to Rome, should send them greeting: they probably left Rome when he did, if not before.

In like manner, it will be found, that

## INTRODUCTION.

most of the difficulties felt in regarding *vv. 3–16* as written at Rome in A.D. 58, are easily removed, if we suppose it to have been written *after his first imprisonment*. The accumulation of names, the endearing epithets, the characteristic descriptions of so many of the Roman Christians, no longer present any difficulties, but are, on the contrary, *most natural* after the Apostle's long imprisonment, with its many opportunities of gaining converts to the faith, of forming intimate friendships, and of receiving much necessary help and kindness.

The warning against false teachers (*vv. 17–20*) is not merely consistent with this supposition of a later date, but adds much to its probability. For during his imprisonment at Rome St. Paul writes to the Philippians (*i. 15–17*), “*Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife; and some also of good will: the one preach Christ of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds: but the other of love.*” It is evident that the warning (*Rom. xvi. 17–20*) is much more natural and forcible, if written after St. Paul had quitted Rome, leaving these false Teachers behind him.

If this theory, that *Rom. xvi. 3–20* is part of a letter written to Rome *after St. Paul's imprisonment there*, be accepted as in itself probable, it will help to confirm the tradition of a second imprisonment, and the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles.

§ 9.<sup>1</sup> AUTHORITIES FOR THE TEXT.

## (1) Uncial Greek Manuscripts.

(a) The same as for the Gospels and Acts.

**A** Codex Sinaiticus contains the Pauline Epistles entire.

**A.** Codex Alexandrinus: wants 2 Cor. iv. 13–xii. 6.

**B.** Codex Vaticanus: Heb. ix. 14–xiii. 25 by a later hand.

**C.** Codex Ephraem Syri: wants the following passages,—

Rom. ii. 5–iii. 21; ix. 6–x. 15; xi. 31–xiii. 10.

<sup>1</sup> For references in the notes to § 9 for discussions on “The Law,” and “The Flesh,” see Appendix to this Introduction.

- 1 Cor. vii. 18–ix. 6; xiii. 8–xv. 40.
- 2 Cor. x. 8—Gal. i. 20.
- Eph. i. 1–ii. 18; iv. 17—Phil. i. 22.
- Phil. iii. 5–iv. 23.
- 1 Thess. ii. 9–2 Thess. iii. 18.
- Heb. i. 1–ii. 4; vii. 26–ix. 15; x. 24–xii. 15.
- 1 Tim. i. 1–iii. 9; v. 20–vi. 21.

For notices of these famous Uncial MSS. see Scrivener, ‘Introduction to the Criticism of the N. T.’ 2nd ed., pp. 83–109, Tischendorf, 7th ed., Prolegomena cxxxv.—cli., and ‘N. T. Graece, ex Sin. Cod.’ 1865. Compare also the Introduction to St. John’s Gospel, pp. lxxxix.—xciv., and the Introduction to Acts, pp. 345, 346.

(b) The following MSS. are not the same as those which are known by the same letters in the Gospels.

- D. Codex Claromontanus, a very important MS. of the 6th century, Greek and Latin. It contains St. Paul’s Epistles entire, except Rom. i. 1–7; also in Rom. i. 24–27 the Latin only, in Rom. i. 27–30 both Greek and Latin, and in 1 Cor. xiv. 13–22 the Greek only are supplied by later hands. See Scrivener, p. 151, Tischendorf (7th ed.), p. clxxxi.
- E. Codex Sangermanensis, a mere transcript of D, made by some ignorant scribe: “the Greek is manifestly worthless, and should long since have been removed from the list of authorities” (Scrivener, p. 153). The Latin (e) is thought to be a little better.
- F. Codex Augiensis, Greek and Latin, of the 9th century, at Trinity College, Cambridge, edited by Scrivener, 1859. “The Epistles of St. Paul are defective in Rom. i. 1–iii. 19; and the Greek alone in 1 Cor. iii. 8–16; vi. 7–14; Col. ii. 1–8; Philem. 21–25.” In the Epistle to the Hebrews the Greek is wholly lost. See Scrivener, p. 154; Tisch. (7), p. clxxxv.
- G. Boernerianus, at Dresden, part of the same volume as Δ of the Gospels, Codex Sangallensis, of the 9th century. The Greek text of 13 Epistles of St. Paul is from the same source as F, both being probably derived from a stichometrical MS. much older than themselves. The interlinear Latin is the Itala much altered. See Scrivener, p. 157; Tisch. (7), p. clxxxviii. It wants Rom. i. 1–5; ii. 16–26; and in the other Pauline Epistles the same passages which are wanting in F.
- K. Mosquensis, a MS. of the 9th century, at Moscow, containing the Catholic Epistles entire, and St. Paul’s Epistles, except Rom. x. 18, 1 Cor. vi. 13, and 1 Cor. viii. 7–11. Scrivener, p. 149.

- L.** Codex Angelicus, formerly Passionei, of the 9th century, contains Acts (beginning at viii. 10), the Catholic Epistles, St. Paul's, and Hebrews as far as xiii. 10.
- P.** Codex Porfirianus, a palimpsest of the 9th century, edited by Tischendorf in the 5th and 6th volumes of his 'Monumenta Sacra Inedita.' It contains Acts, all the Epistles, and the Apocalypse, but is defective in the following among other passages : Rom. ii. 15—iii. 5 ; viii. 33—ix. 11 ; xi. 22—xii. 1. See Scrivener, p. 150.

The readings of all the MSS. hitherto mentioned, are quoted by Tischendorf (8), and of all except E, by Tregelles.

The letters F\*, H, I, M, indicate certain ancient and valuable fragments of uncial MSS., of which notices will be found in Scrivener, pp. 154—160.

(2) Of *Cursive Greek MSS.* there are for St. Paul's Epistles, nearly 300 : the following are cited by Tregelles throughout his text, and frequently by Tischendorf.

17 (=Evang. 33), on parchment, of the 11th century, at Paris.

37 (Ev. 69), of the 14th century, at Leicester.  
47, in the Bodleian, of the 11th century.

Tischendorf also names 67\*\* as containing remarkable readings, very similar to B.

### (3) Versions.

The most ancient versions, especially the Latin, are of great importance for the criticism of the Greek text, being credible witnesses of its form at a time one or two centuries earlier than the oldest extant MSS.

The *Old Latin*, or *Itala* (it), dating from the 2nd century, is represented in St. Paul's Epistles chiefly by the Latin versions (d, e, f, g), attached to the Greek Uncials D, E, F, G. Tischendorf also quotes (gue) certain fragments of the 6th century, attached to the Gothic version of the Wolfenbüttel palimpsests (Codex Guelferbytianus), which contain Rom. xi. 33—xii. 5 ; xii. 17—xiii. 1 ; xiv. 9—20 ; xv. 3—13.

A few fragments (r), have also been found on the covers of the Frisingen MS. at Munich, containing parts of Rom. xiv., xv., and other passages of

St. Paul's Epistles enumerated by Tischendorf (7), Proleg. p. cclxvi.

*The Vulgate*, or Latin version corrected by Jerome, is best represented by the two following MSS. of the 6th century.

Codex Amiatinus (am), edited by Tischendorf, and adopted by Tregelles as the basis of his Latin text, was formerly in the Monastery of Monte Amiatio, but is now at Florence. "It was written about the year 541, by the Abbot Servandus" (Tisch. 8, p. cclvii.).

Codex Fuldensis (fu), in the Abbey of Fulda, in Hesse Cassel, was written in 546, by order of Victor, Bishop of Capua, and corrected and dated with his own hand. It is remarkable for the peculiar system of capitulation prefixed to the Epistle to the Romans, on which see above, § 8, p. 22.

On the Syriac, and other ancient versions used for criticism of the Text, the reader is referred to Tischendorf, Scrivener, or the Introductions to the N. T. by Tregelles, Bleek, and Hilgenfeld.

### (4) Fathers.

Among the Greek Fathers, Origen stands pre-eminent as "the prince of ancient Critics" (Tischendorf). In his Commentary on the Romans, various readings are often expressly discussed, and in such cases his testimony is indisputable. Next to him Tischendorf ranks Clement of Alexandria, and Ireneus: the work of the latter 'Against all Heretics,' is extant for the most part only in a very ancient Latin translation; but an illustration of its great value will be found in our Additional Note on Rom. v. 6.

Chrysostom's Homilies on all the Pauline Epistles are often useful to the critic of the text, as well as invaluable to the interpreter.

The earliest Latin Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles is that which is found in the works of St. Ambrose, and usually ascribed to Hilary the Deacon (Ambrosiaster), who is supposed to have lived at the close of the 3rd century.

On the value of the Fathers as witnesses to the Text, see Tischendorf (7) pp. cclv.—cclxix.

## INTRODUCTION.

## 10. CONTENTS AND ARGUMENT.

The main Divisions of the Epistle are clearly marked :

- I. The Introduction, i. 1-15 ;
- II. The Doctrine, "The Righteousness of God by Faith," i. 16-viii.;
- III. The Doctrine reconciled with Israel's unbelief, ix.—xi. ;
- IV. Exhortation to Christian Duties, general and special, xii. 1—xv. 13 ;
- V. Conclusion, xv. 14—xvi. 27.

## I. THE INTRODUCTION :

- (a) Address of the Epistle (i. 1-7) ;
- (b) The Writer's Motives (8-15).

(a) THE INTRODUCTION is marked throughout by an earnest desire to win for himself and for his Gospel the confidence and goodwill of an important Christian community to which as yet he was personally unknown. This motive is seen in the threefold description of the *official character* which gives him the right to address them, as being Christ's servant, duly called to the Apostleship, and set apart as a chosen vessel to carry a message of glad tidings from God (*v. 1*).

In that message God's promises to His ancient people are fulfilled in Him who was both born of the seed of David to be Israel's Messiah, and proved by the Resurrection to be that Son of God who giveth life unto the world and hath all the Heathen for His inheritance. The Apostle of One who is thus manifested as the Saviour of the world must speak in His name to "*all nations*," and therefore to those at Rome also who by a Divine calling are already His (*vv. 2-6*: see above, pp. 12, 13). To all such who are in Rome, whether Jew or Gentile, beloved of God as partakers of His holy calling, Paul the Apostle sends this greeting: "*Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ*" (*v. 7*).

(b) To make his Apostolic claims the more acceptable St. Paul expresses his personal interest in the welfare of his readers, in thanksgiving for their faith (*v. 8*), in prayer that he may be permitted to see them (*vv. 9-12*), and in an

assurance that he has long desired and still is eager to fulfil the duty of preaching the Gospel at Rome (*vv. 13-15*).

## II. THE DOCTRINE : "THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD BY FAITH :"

- (a) The Theme (i. 16, 17) ;
- (b) The universal need of Righteousness (i. 18—iii. 20) ;
- (c) The Universality of Righteousness by Faith (iii. 21—v.) ;
- (d) The Sanctification of the Believer (vi.—viii.).

## (a) THEME OF THE EPISTLE.

The mention of the Gospel, which St. Paul would fain have preached at Rome in person, leads naturally to a description of it as the great Theme of his Epistle (*vv. 16, 17*). In this brief statement of the subject we discern already the leading thoughts and main scope of the treatise which follows. The Gospel is no mere word of man, but (1) a "*power of God*" directed to man's salvation; a power which can not only do "*what the Law could not do*" (*viii. 3*), save from sin, but also create and impart a new life of righteousness.

(2) This "*power of God unto salvation*" is universal in its purpose, being needed and intended for "*every one*;" and in this universality "*the Jew*" is expressly included by name with "*the Greek*" or Gentile world. The priority assigned to the Jew in the received reading (*πρῶτον*) does not mean that he is to have a preference and advantage, but only that the salvation long promised to the Fathers is to be offered to him first: its condition is the same for him and for the Gentile: God's salvation is (3) for "*every one that believeth*." This definition of the Gospel as bringing salvation to every believer is confirmed in *v. 17*, on which see the notes.

(b) THE UNIVERSAL NEED OF RIGHTEOUSNESS is seen in the unrighteousness of all, first of the Gentile (i. 18-32), and then of the Jew (ii. 1—iii. 20).

The foundation which St. Paul lays in this section (i. 18-32) is too broad and deep for an argument intended only to serve some occasional purpose arising out of the peculiar circumstances of the

Christians at Rome. Had it been his sole or chief purpose to remove the prejudices and abate the claims of Jewish Christians, there would have been no adequate motive for his elaborate description of the depravity of the Heathen world. So terrible a picture of sins against God and against nature, from some of the worst of which the Jews were comparatively free, must have been intended primarily to arouse the conscience of the Heathens themselves, and to prove their need of righteousness. Subordinate to this main purpose is the rhetorical use which the Apostle makes of the moral indignation which such a description could not fail to rouse in the Jew against the "sinners of the Gentiles."

Looking back from this point at the Introduction (*vv. 1-15*) we can understand St. Paul's anxiety to commend himself and his Gospel to the Romans, without assuming any intention either to attack or to conciliate an adverse Judaizing majority. His motive, which we can now clearly discern, was simply an earnest desire to win from all a favourable hearing for a Gospel which must at the outset be unwelcome both to Jew and Gentile, and more especially to the Jew, because it is founded on the fact that all alike are under sin, and exposed to God's wrath. The same motive explains why the order of *v. 17* is reversed, and the Gentile first brought in guilty with the full assent of the Jew, who suddenly finds himself involved in the same condemnation: compare the note on *ii. 1*.

Knowing even more clearly than the Heathen "*the judgment of God, that they who do such things are worthy of death*," the man who judges them, and does the same, is without excuse (*ii. 1, 2*). No personal privilege can exempt him from judgment, for God is no respecter of persons, but will render to every man according to his deeds, to the Jew first and also to the Gentile (*vv. 3-11*). The law will not benefit the Jew unless he be a doer of the law: even the Gentile will be judged by the law written on his heart (*vv. 12-16*). In vain therefore the Jew glories in a law which he does

not keep, and in a circumcision which is only that of the flesh, not of the heart (*vv. 17-29*).

### iii. 1-8. THE JEW'S OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

Has then the Jew no real advantage? Yes, the oracles containing God's promises. Though disbelieved by some, their truth is unimpaired: they shall yet be fulfilled (*vv. 1-4*: compare *ix. 6; xi. 25-32*).

Man's unbelief exalts God's faithfulness. Is God unrighteous then in punishing this unbelief? Nay, for then it would be unrighteous to judge any sin. Yet if sin is overruled unto His glory, why judge the sinner? Why should we not rather go on sinning to His greater glory? The very thought deserves God's righteous condemnation.

### iii. 9-20. THE SCRIPTURES CONFIRM THE CHARGE OF UNIVERSAL SINFULNESS.

If the Jew is exempted from Judgment neither by the Law, nor by circumcision, nor by the promises which remain true in spite of his unbelief—What then remains? Can we claim to be better in fact than the Heathen? Can we say that we Jews are "*doers of the law!*" Nay, in no wise: for the charge before made, that all are under sin, is confirmed by our own Scriptures. They testify that all, Jews as well as Heathens, are transgressors of God's law: and that law is binding on the Jew to whom it directly speaks God's commandments, that his mouth as well as every other may be stopped, and all brought into judgment before God, because by law man cannot attain to righteousness, but only to knowledge of sin.

Even apart from the repeated mention of the name "*Jew*" in this and the preceding chapter, it is evident that the errors which St. Paul uproots, and the sins which he condemns, are not those of the Jewish Christian, but of the unbelieving Jew. In the readiness to judge others, and the presumptuous hope of personal exemption from God's judgment (*ii. 1-16*), in the arrogance, hypocrisy, and self-

## INTRODUCTION.

complacency of the sinner who in the midst of his sins makes his boast of God and the Law, and is confident that he is "*a guide of the blind, a light of them which are in darkness*" (17-24), in the absolute reliance on circumcision (25-29), in the daring protest, "*Why yet am I also judged as a sinner?*" (iii. 7), repeated in ix. 19, "*Why doth he yet find fault?*"—in all this we see something very different from the legal and ceremonial tendencies of Jewish Christianity, we see the glaring sins and errors of Judaism itself in its worst state of corruption.

## (c) THE UNIVERSALITY OF THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF FAITH.

From the universal need of the salvation described in i. 16, 17 St. Paul now passes on to its actual manifestation. He has shown that all alike are under sin, all exposed to God's wrath: the privileges of the Jew, though real and great, do not exempt him from judgment, nor does the law enable him to attain by his own works to righteousness. "*But now,*" in the new dispensation of the Gospel, in contrast to wrath revealed from heaven against the unrighteousness of man, we see the "*righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith.*" This is the second point in the proof of the Thesis laid down in i. 16, 17.

## iii. 21-26. THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD MADE MANIFEST.

The essential characteristics of the righteousness of God are here combined.

(1) Independent of "law" as a condition of earning righteousness, it is witnessed by "*the law*" as a Divine revelation (v. 21).

(2) The mode in which man receives it is "*through faith in Jesus Christ,*" in which definition faith is seen to be the principle of that personal living union between Christ and the believer (v. 22) which is the root in man of all justifying and all sanctifying righteousness.

(3) Its universal destination "*unto all and upon all them that believe*" results

from the nature of faith, as a condition corresponding to the true relation of all mankind to God, and therefore fitted to supply the universal want of "*the glory of God*" (vv. 22, 23; compare the notes on i. 16, 17 as to the nature of faith).

(4) The free and gratuitous character of God's salvation is seen, in that all who partake of it are justified not by merit but "*freely by His grace*" (v. 24).

(5) The substance of salvation, the gift which God's grace bestows and man's faith accepts, is "*the redemption that is in Christ Jesus*" (v. 24).

(6) The first cause of this redemption is God the Father's love: its method, "*propitiation*," i.e. an expiation for sin by which man is restored to God's favour: the efficient cause of propitiation, the one true sacrifice, Christ "*in His own blood:*" the appropriation by man of this redemption, "*through faith:*" the purpose of God in thus setting forth Christ,—"*for an exhibition of his righteousness,*" because He had suffered the sins of former generations to pass unpunished in the forbearance which He exercised "*in view of the exhibition of his righteousness*" in this present time," that now He might be both righteous Himself as condemning sin and the author of righteousness to him, "*that is of faith in Jesus,*" i.e. who sees in the death of Christ the death for sin which he has himself deserved, and the death unto sin of which he is henceforth to partake.

## iii. 27-31. JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH INDEPENDENT OF LAW.

The righteousness of God, not being earned by works of law, excludes man's boasting (vv. 27, 28), recognises one God as the author of salvation for Jew and Gentile (vv. 29, 30), and far from abolishing "law," establishes it in its true character as a law of faith: compare viii. 4.

## iv. 1-25. THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD IS WITNESSED BY THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS.

Even Abraham, the great pattern of

righteousness, was justified by faith and not by merit of works (*vv. 1-5*), in accordance with David's description of the blessedness of free and undeserved forgiveness (*vv. 6-8*).

The righteousness of God is for all, not for the circumcised only: for circumcision was not the cause but the sign and seal of Abraham's justification by faith, marking him out as the father of all them that believe (*vv. 9-12*).

The inheritance of the Promise, depending not on law but on faith, is made sure to *all* the seed (*vv. 13-17*).

Abraham's faith, both in its strength, and in its object—"God who quickeneth the dead," is recorded for our example (*vv. 17-25*).

#### V. I-II. REDEMPTION BY THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

The blessings received by those who are "*justified freely by God's grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus*" (*iii. 24, 25*) are Peace, Joy, and Hope of glory, all founded on God's love, which having reconciled enemies by Christ's death will much more surely save the reconciled by His life.

#### V. I2-II. THE UNIVERSALITY OF SALVATION BY FAITH, LIKE THE UNIVERSALITY OF SIN, IS BASED ON THE UNITY OF MANKIND IN ADAM AND IN CHRIST.

In the preceding argument the universal sinfulness of man has been established as a fact to which experience and Scripture both bear witness, but simply as a fact without any declaration of the cause of its universality.

On the other hand the universal salvation which God has prepared depends on Christ alone: instead of each man earning the pardon of his sins by virtue of his own repentance and subsequent obedience to the law, One dies for all, and for His sake not only forgiveness but righteousness and life are bestowed on all that believe in Him (*v. 6-11*). The universality of salvation is thus traced to its cause in the principle that "*the many*," "*the all*," are included in "*the One*."

The Apostle now extends and completes his argument by showing that the Old Testament traces the universality of sin and death to the same principle: the one man through whom sin and death came into the world, and passed upon all men, is a type of the One through Whom come righteousness and life to all (*vv. 12-14*).

But this comparison involves also a contrast: God's grace is greater and more abundant than man's transgression: righteousness and life are in their nature mightier powers than sin and death. If sin and death could pass from one to all, *much more* shall righteousness and life (*vv. 15-19*).

We notice in *v. 18* a pregnant phrase "*justification of life*," which combines and reconciles two leading elements of St. Paul's doctrine of salvation. On these two elements taken separately two opposite systems of doctrine have been raised, namely justification by imputation only, and justification by or on account of actual righteousness wrought in man by *faith working through love*.

The phrase "*justification of life*" occurs at a point of St. Paul's argument where these two elements of his teaching meet: for the doctrine of justification by faith without works of law ending with c. iv., and the doctrine of life in Christ, as the remedy for inherent sin and source of inherent righteousness, beginning at c. v., are both included in "*justification of life*." Faith, whereby we receive God's justifying sentence, is also the means by which we receive the new "*life*" that brings forth righteousness or holiness of living.

"If there had been a *law* given which could have *given life*, verily *righteousness* should have been by *law*" (*Gal. iii. 21*). But no place has yet been found for *law* in this "*justification of life*." St. Paul, however, now proceeds to show that "*law*" itself was in one way subservient to grace, even by multiplying transgression (*vv. 20, 21*).

Reserving his explanation of this purpose of the law to Ch. vii., the Apostle hastens at once to meet the formidable difficulty which so strange a statement could not fail to raise in the

## INTRODUCTION.

mind not only of a conscientious Jew but of every thoughtful reader.

(d) THE SANCTIFICATION OF THE BELIEVER.

In iii. 8, St. Paul has alluded very briefly to a false charge that by his teaching he encouraged the wicked thought, "*Let us do evil that good may come.*" His doctrine of grace has in fact in all ages been misrepresented by unscrupulous opponents and perverted by hypocritical supporters. His own answer to the question, "*Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?*" should have made such perversion of his teaching impossible. That answer is founded on the same mystical union between Christ and the believer which is also the ground of his justification: and the doctrine of God's free grace through faith in Christ is thus found to be the only sure foundation for holiness of life.

vi. THE MORAL EFFECTS OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

The believer baptized into the death of Christ both dies with Him to sin, and rises in Him to newness of life (*vv. 1-11*). Let this truth be realised henceforth in your lives (*vv. 12, 13*), for this is the right effect of being no longer "*under law but under grace*" (*v. 14*), that you are released from the bondage of sin, and set free for the service of God (*vv. 15-23*), free, and yet "*servants to righteousness unto sanctification.*"

vii. DELIVERANCE FROM THE BONDAGE OF LAW AND OF SIN.

Hitherto St. Paul has spoken of the law in a negative sense: he has shown that it had not in fact enabled the Jew (Ch. ii.), and according to the Scripture could not enable any man, to attain to righteousness by works, but only to a knowledge of sin (iii. 20); that it has no part in the manifestation of the righteousness of God, except as a witness (iii. 21); that as a law of works it could not exclude man's boasting (iii. 27); that it was not attached as a condition to the inheritance of Abraham's blessing

(iv. 13); that it worketh wrath (iv. 15); that its effect was the imputation of sin, and the multiplication of transgression (*v. 13, 20*); and thus under law men were brought into bondage to sin (*vi. 14*).

Such a disparaging view of the law must have been a grievous obstacle to a conscientious but unenlightened Jew: it needed both to be explained and supplemented.

It is explained by the principle that the power of law is terminated by death: for example, as a wife is released from the law that binds her to her husband by his death, and is free to marry another, so the believer by the death of "*the old man*" with Christ (*vi. 6*) is released from the law, and free to be united to another, even Christ, who is raised from the dead (*vii. 1-6*).

*vv. 7-13. RELATION OF THE LAW TO SIN.*

If that former union was a bondage to sin, and if to be free from sin we must be free from the law, the question arises, "*Is the law sin?*" In answer to this question St. Paul proceeds to supplement his account of the law by showing its true nature, and its actual relation to sin (*vv. 7-13*). Sin, or in other words the perverse opposition of man's will, is roused into activity by the law, and exhibits its exceeding sinfulness as a power working death by means of the law which was ordained to life. For the law in itself is holy, just, and good: it is "*spiritual*," as being a Divine revelation, but it is not a life-giving spirit, and therefore cannot enable man to overcome the power of sin.

*vv. 14-25. THE CONFLICT OF FLESH AND SPIRIT.*

The Apostle confirms his vindication of the Divine Law by an analysis of the working of sin, as he had observed it in his own inner experience. At first he speaks of himself as if that part of his nature which in action predominates were the whole man; "*The law is spiritual; but I am of flesh, sold under sin.*" But closer observation reveals an inner conflict: the flesh, in

which dwelleth no good thing is not the whole man (*v. 18*), there is another "I," consenting unto the law *that it is good*;" this better self, "*the inward man*" (*v. 22*), "*the mind*" (*v. 23*), or what St. Paul calls in *1 Cor. ii. 11*, "*the spirit of man that is in him*," delights in the law of God, but is overpowered by the sin which rules as a law in the members of the outward man. This true self cries in anguish, "Who shall deliver me?" and the cry is at once turned into thanksgiving by remembrance of the deliverance already wrought by God through Jesus Christ (*vv. 24, 25*).

### viii. THE SPIRIT OF LIFE IN CHRIST JESUS BRINGS LIBERTY TO THE CHILDREN OF GOD, AND COMFORTS THEM WITH THE HOPE OF GLORY.

The doctrine that man is justified freely by God's grace through union with Christ (*v. 12—21*) has been defended against two chief objections of the Jew. It has been shown (1) in Ch. vi. that far from encouraging continuance in sin, the union with Christ *implies in principle* a death unto sin, and an entire release from its dominion; and (2) in Ch. vii. that the Law, though holy and spiritual in itself and recognised as such by man's mind or spirit, cannot overcome the power of sin in the flesh, but rather becomes an occasion of strengthening its dominion.

The question, "Who shall deliver me?" is now to be answered: "*The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus.*" Sin already condemned in the flesh by Christ's death is to be destroyed by "*the Spirit of life*" which He imparts for the fulfilment of the righteousness of the law (*vv. 1—4*). This Divine Spirit not only subdues "*the mind of the flesh*," which "*is enmity against God*" and therefore "*death*," but will at last give life even to the body now dead because of sin (*vv. 5—13*).

The same Spirit of Christ testifies that we are sons of God, and partakers of His inheritance of glory if we partake of His sufferings now (*vv. 14—17*). No present suffering is to be compared with that glory, for which the whole creation

is groaning and sighing, and we ourselves are waiting in hope of its completion by the redemption of our body (*vv. 18—25*). Already we have help for our infirmity in the Spirit's intercession (*vv. 25—27*), and the knowledge "*that all things (even sufferings) work together for good to them that love God*," because they "*are called according to His purpose*."

For whom *He foreknew as loving Him*, He predestined to be conformed to the image of His Son, and that predestination cannot fail to be accomplished in their calling and justification, and glorification, because nothing can separate them from God's love (*vv. 28—39*).

We pause for a moment to establish our interpretation of this most difficult and important passage by the authority of the first Christian Father, Clement of Rome, "who had seen the blessed Apostles and conversed with them, and still had the preaching of the Apostles ringing in his ears and their tradition before his eyes" (*Iren. iii. 3, § 3*). In the newly recovered portion of St. Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians (*lxix. 9*) we find a clear reference to Rom. viii. 28 in the words: "Who dost make many nations upon earth, and out of all didst choose them that love thee through Jesus Christ thy beloved Son, through Whom Thou didst chasten sanctify, and honour us."

### III. THE DOCTRINE RECONCILED WITH ISRAEL'S UNEASINESS.

The purely doctrinal portion of the Epistle is concluded. Each part of the Theme proposed in *i. 16, 17* has now been developed in a clear and closely connected argument. Without Christ all nations alike are lying under the wrath of God, all without excuse, the Heathen condemned by his own conscience (*i. 32*), the Jew by the law to which he trusts in vain to justify him by his own works (*iii. 20*). But now in Christ the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith, independent of law yet witnessed by the law and the Prophets, extending unto all them that believe God's gifts of peace and hope and everlasting life.

That St. Paul has treated the doctrine of justification by faith with especial reference to the prejudices of the Jews is obvious. But it is not a necessary inference from this mode of treatment, that a Judaizing tendency prevailed among his readers.

The objections brought forward on the part of the Jew are inherent in the subject itself, and must have entered into a discussion of the doctrine to whomsoever addressed.

Moreover St. Paul's own mind was full of the questions concerning Judaism, and the mode of treating it. The Epistle to the Churches of Galatia had been written but a short time before : there the Judaizing party had striven to the utmost to accommodate Christianity itself to Jewish prejudices. St. Paul had vehemently opposed this retrograde movement both in person and in his Epistle. Now he could regard the whole question of the relation of Judaism to the Gospel more calmly, deliberately, and comprehensively. For he was writing to a Church in which he had no personal antagonists, and where party-spirit had not yet embittered the great controversy : a Church moreover set in the midst of so numerous a colony of unbelieving Jews, that the question of their rejection was seen in all the greatness of its proportions.

Hence we see that the subject discussed in Chapters ix—xi. cannot possibly be regarded as a mere historical appendix, nor as a corollary to the previous doctrine : it is in fact the reconciliation of that doctrine to the great and pressing difficulty which had arisen from the rejection of the Gospel by the great mass of the Jewish people.

#### ix. 1-5. MOURNING OVER ISRAEL.

With seeming abruptness, yet in close connexion of thought, St. Paul passes from the joyful assurance of salvation for all the elect of God (viii. 28-39) to the mournful and mysterious contrast presented by the exclusion of the chosen people on whom so many and great privileges had been bestowed.

#### *vv. 6-13. GOD'S PROMISE HAS NOT FAILED.*

The present rejection of Israel is not to be regarded as a failure of God's promise ; the unbelief of some does not make the faithfulness of God of none effect, iii. 3 ; for the promise was not to all the seed of Abraham after the flesh, but to the chosen seed, not to Ishmael but to Isaac, not to Esau but to Jacob.

#### *vv. 14-18. NOR IS THERE ANY INJUSTICE IN GOD.*

Far be it from us to say that God is unjust in thus choosing one and rejecting another, before they have done good or evil. His choice is not determined by the merit of man's works, but by His own free and undeserved mercy, for it is proved by His words to Moses and to Pharaoh that "*on whom he will, he hath mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.*" On the reference to Pharaoh in v. 17 see the foot-note and the Additional note at the end of the chapter.

#### *vv. 19-21. GOD'S ALMIGHTY WILL MAY NOT BE QUESTIONED.*

If God's will is absolutely free and irresistible, "*why doth He yet find fault?*" Why hold man responsible?

The Apostle first rebukes the arrogance of thus contending with God, and asserts that His rightful power (*έξορία*) over man is as absolute and unquestionable as that of the potter over the clay that he fashions.

Had this been the only answer, the Jew could not have found fault with it, for it is drawn from his Scriptures ; but St. Paul has another answer.

#### *vv. 22-29. GOD'S JUSTICE AND MERCY VINDICATED.*

After asserting God's unquestionable right to deal with the creatures of His hand according to His Will, the Apostle proceeds to justify God's actual dealing with Israel, as characterised by long-suffering towards those who were deserving only of wrath, and by mercy towards those whom He called both from

among Jews and also from among Gentiles to be His people.

Moreover both the calling of the Gentiles, and the rejection of all except a small remnant of Israel, had been foretold by the Prophets,—a proof that there had been no failure of His promise in its true meaning.

#### **vv. 30-33. THE PARADOX EXPLAINED.**

It is a strange result that Gentiles who were not consciously seeking righteousness attained to righteousness, while Israel, who sought, did not attain unto a law of righteousness. And wherefore? Because the Jews did not seek what the Gentiles attained, a righteousness of *faith*, but sought righteousness by works of law, and so stumbled against the Rock which was laid in Zion for a sure foundation to every one that *believeth*.

We must not leave this Chapter without drawing attention to the great importance of the statement of Christ's Deity in *v. 5*, and to the general misunderstanding of the passage concerning Pharaoh (*v. 17*) consequent on the defective translation of the original passage in the A. V. Both points are fully discussed in the Additional Notes to the Chapter.

#### **x. 1-4.—THE CAUSE OF ISRAEL'S STUMBLING.**

They sought to establish their own righteousness by works of law, and refused to submit to God's righteousness which is attained by *faith*, because they were ignorant that "*law*," regarded as a way of attaining to righteousness before God, is at an end in Christ, in order that righteousness may be extended to every one that *believeth*.

#### **vv. 5-10. THE TESTIMONY OF MOSES.**

Israel ought not to have been ignorant of "*the righteousness which is of faith*," for Moses himself not only "*describeth the righteousness which is of law*," but also speaks of another kind of righteousness, a religion of the heart, which is the righteousness of *faith* in Christ.

#### **vv. 11-21. THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF FAITH IS OFFERED TO ALL, BUT REJECTED BY ISRAEL.**

St. Paul emphatically asserts the universality of the statement already quoted in ix. 33, "Whosoever believeth on Him shall not be ashamed" (Isai. xviii. 16) as proving that in the righteousness of *faith* there is no difference between Jew and Greek; and then from two other passages (Joel ii. 30; Isai. lii. 7) proves that the Gospel must be preached to all.

"*But they did not all obey the glad tidings:*" yet it was not from want of hearing, nor of warning, for Moses and Isaiah foretold both the reception of the Gentiles, and the disobedience of Israel.

#### **xi. THE RESTORATION OF ISRAEL.**

Twice already the Apostle has intimated that the unbelief of the great mass of the Jews has not annulled the faithfulness of God's promises (iii. 3; ix. 6). The same thought is here brought into close connexion with the certainty of salvation for God's elect (viii. 28-39), "*God hath not cast away His people, which He foreknew*," the true Israel. But who are the true Israel? Not the unbelieving mass (compare ix. 6), but the "*remnant according to election of grace*." The existence of such a remnant of believing Israelites amid a general apostasy proves now, as in Elijah's days, that God had not rejected Israel *as a people*.

And as He has not rejected the people on account of the unbelief of the majority, so neither has He preserved the remnant on account of their own merit, but only of grace (vv. 1-6).

What then is the result? The mass of Israel seeking righteousness of works obtained it not; the elect, foreknown of God, and chosen to be His people, obtained righteousness of grace through *faith*: and this hardening of the mass is what the Prophets have foretold as a just judgment from God (vv. 7-10).

But what is God's purpose herein? Is it that they should fall finally? Far from it: already their stumbling has brought salvation to the Gentiles, and this transfer of God's favour shall provoke the Jews to jealousy, and so end in the

## INTRODUCTION.

restoration of God's ancient people, and a new life of the world (*vv. 11-15*). Such a restoration is natural, for the holy root of the chosen race makes its branches holy: ye Gentiles are but grafts of wild olive enriched by that holy root. Boast not that natural branches were broken off to make room for you; for if God spared not them neither will He spare thee, and if they turn from their unbelief, the goodness and power of God which grafted thee contrary to nature into the good olive, shall much more surely graft in again the natural branches (*16-24*).

This Divine purpose, that the hardening of Israel should bring salvation to the Gentiles, and so lead at last to the restoration of all Israel, is a mystery revealed now, and long since indicated in Isaiah: and God's gracious purposes can never fail, but even disobedience is so overruled that He may have mercy upon all (*25-32*).

O depth of God's wisdom surpassing all that man's heart could conceive! O depth of inexhaustible riches, receiving from none but giving freely to all! For from Him as their first cause all things begin, through Him still working in them they work together, and unto Him they tend as the final cause of all: "To Whom be the glory for ever, Amen" (*vv. 33-56*).

It is impossible to look back on the whole course of the Apostle's argument, from the revelation of God's wrath against an ungodly world (*i. 18*) to this mystery of God's all-embracing mercy, without feeling that, whatever local, temporary, or personal circumstances may have induced St. Paul to address this letter to Rome, such an exposition of the Gospel could only have proceeded from the mind of one who was moved by the Holy Ghost to write for all ages and for all mankind. "A more far-reaching glance was never cast over the Divine plan of the history of the world" (Godet).

#### IV. EXHORTATION TO CHRISTIAN DUTIES.

The doctrinal part of the Epistle now concluded is followed by an exposition

of Christian duty closely connected with it, and hardly less systematic and comprehensive. It consists of two main portions:

(a) The general duties of the Christian life (*xii., xiii.*);

(b) The special duty of mutual forbearance and charity in regard to things non-essential (*xiv. 1-xv. 13*).

#### (a) xii., xiii. THE CHRISTIAN'S DUTIES TOWARDS GOD, AND TOWARDS MAN.

The Apostle has set forth "*the mercies of God*" in his survey of the Divine purpose and method of salvation. These mercies he now applies as motives to holiness, beginning with the central thought of self-consecration. Conform not even outwardly to the fashion of this world, but be inwardly transformed, your bodies being devoted to God's service, your minds renewed to know His perfect will (*1, 2*).

Presume not on special gifts, but as members of one body in Christ employ them for the good of all (*3-8*). Let love, the soul of all Christian virtues, animate your conduct towards your brethren in Christ, and towards all men, even your enemies (*9-21*).

Obey the rulers of the State, as powers ordained of God (*xiii. 1-7*). Fulfil the royal law of mutual love (*8-10*), and remembering that the day of Christ is at hand, put on the armour of light, put on the new man (*11-14*).

#### (b) xiv. 1—xv. 13. SPECIAL EXHORTATION TO MUTUAL FORBEARANCE BETWEEN CHRISTIANS.

Despise not the scruples of the weak conscience, neither condemn the freedom of the strong. We are all God's servants: do all things as unto the Lord: and prepare for His judgment, instead of judging one another (*1-13*). In things indifferent give no offence; for meat or drink lead not thy brother into sin (*24-23*).

Let the strong bear with the weak, as Christ has borne with us: receive one another, as Christ has received us (*xv. 1-7*). He came to fulfil God's

promises to Israel, and to extend God's mercy to the Gentiles : rejoice in Him, for ye are all His people (8-13).

The Apostle's reason for addressing to the Christians at Rome this special exhortation to mutual forbearance is to be sought in the divergence of views between the Jewish and Gentile believers : see above, pp. 17, 18.

#### V. CONCLUSION :

(a) The writer's motives and prospects (xv. 14-33);

(b) Concluding salutations (xvi.).

(a) Bear with my boldness in admonishing you, for I am a minister of Christ, to present the Gentiles as an acceptable offering (14-16). I glory therefore, yet only in what Christ has wrought through my preaching His Gospel to them who had not heard His name (17-21). Often hindered by this duty, I now am free to come to you on my journey into Spain, as soon as I have carried to Jerusalem the alms of the Gentile Churches here (22-29). Pray for my deliverance from the unbelieving Jews, for the acceptance of my service by the saints, and for my coming to you in joy. "And the God of peace be with you all" (30-33).

(b) Commendation of Phœbe (1, 2); Apostolic greetings (3-16); Warning against false teachers (17-20); Salutations from St. Paul's companions (21-23); Benediction (24); Doxology (25-27).

On the contents of this Chapter compare § 8, pp. 24-29.

There is a close correspondence between the Introduction and the Conclusion of the Epistle, both in form and thought. The section (a) answers to i. 8-15, while in (b) we find in the Doxology a fulness of thought and majesty of expression which harmonize well with the character of the opening address (i. 1-7).

#### APPENDIX.

##### "THE LAW," THE FLESH."

In several important passages of this Epistle it is essential to a right understanding of St. Paul's argument that we

should be able to determine the exact meaning of the word "*law*" (*vόπος*) with and without the Definite Article.

"It must be admitted," says Bp. Middleton, 'On the Greek Article,' p. 303, "that there is scarcely in the whole N. T. any greater difficulty than the ascertaining of the various meanings of *vόπος* in the Epistles of St. Paul."

One of the earliest remarks on the subject is that of Origen on Rom. iii. 21 : "Moris est apud Graecos nominibus ἀρθρα praeponi, quæ apud nos possunt Articuli nominari. Si quando igitur Mosis legem nominat, solitum nomini premittit Articulum : si quando vero naturalem vult intelligi, sine Articulo nominat legem." Though the form of the first sentence ("apud Graecos," "apud nos") shews that it is due to the Latin translator Rufinus, the rule about the use of the article seems to have proceeded from Origen himself : for it is the basis of his whole interpretation of Rom. iii. 21, both in the Commentary and in the Philocalia, cap. ix.

It is admitted on all hands that this rule, so far as it refers to the Law of Moses is *generally true*, i.e. that where the law of Moses is meant *vόπος* usually has the Article prefixed.

Is the rule true without exceptions?

If there are any exceptions, are they merely arbitrary, or can they be explained on any known principle, so as not to destroy the general rule?

In other words does St. Paul use *vόπος* and ὁ *vόπος* indifferently to signify the particular law of Moses?

Bp. Middleton maintains the general truth of the rule, admitting "no other exceptions than those by which words the most definite are frequently affected." We must first inquire on what principle the general rule is founded, and then consider the alleged exceptions.

A clear view of the nature of the Article, and of the effect of its insertion or omission, was long since given by Mr. T. S. Green, "Grammar of the N. T. Dialect," 1842, p. 132. "The Article is prefixed to a word, when it conveys an idea already in some degree familiarized to the mind, and in so doing

## INTRODUCTION.

expresses something definite. Definiteness attaches to the *general idea*, when this idea is *identified with one which has been already impressed upon* the mind. The Article is a sign of this identification, and thus is closely but not primarily connected with definiteness." (Slightly abridged.)

Again, p. 165 : "Since the Article is prefixed to a word when its idea is already familiarized, and is a mark or intimation of that circumstance, the natural effect of its presence is to divert the thoughts from dwelling upon the peculiar import of the word, and is *adverse to its inherent notion standing out as a prominent point in the sense of the passage*, it being an unquestionable law that, while novelty excites attention and scrutiny, familiarity is commonly associated with a passing glance."

The first passage to which Mr. Green refers (p. 171) as illustrating "the tendency of the presence of the Article to divert the attention from the peculiar inherent meaning of a word to which it is prefixed, and of its removal to recall it" is Joh. i. 1, Θεός ἦν ὁ Λόγος : "Had the Article been prefixed, the sense would have been, that the Word was identical with the entire essence of the sole Deity. In the actual words Θεός is the predicate ; that is, all that is involved in the notion of Θεός is predicated of the Word, namely the proper nature and attributes of Deity. The absence of the Article, further, admits of the Divine Word being possessed of this nature in common with other beings or Persons."

The importance and correctness of this statement will be at once seen by referring to Professor Westcott's note on the same passage in this Commentary : "It is necessarily without the Article (Θεός not ὁ Θεός) inasmuch as it describes the nature of the Word, and does not identify His Person. It would be pure Sabellianism to say the Word was ὁ Θεός."

Again on Joh. v. 27, Dr. Westcott writes : "The omission of the Article concentrates attention upon the nature, and not upon the personality of Christ."

Again on xix. 7 : "The omission of the Article (*vīos Θeoū*) concentrates

attention upon the nature and not upon the personality of Christ."

We thus see that the principle on which Mr. Green founded the general rule for the insertion or omission of the Article is accepted by Professor Westcott : we shall find presently that it is no less clearly recognised by Bp. Lightfoot.

Unfortunately Mr. Green was not consistent in applying his own principle to St. Paul's use of the word *vōmos* : this, he writes, "is precisely a case in which it might be expected that the constant and familiar use of the word would lead to the dropping of the Article ; and that such was the actual effect, may be concluded from such passages as the following : Rom. x. 4, τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστός, i Macc. ii. 21, καταλιπεῖν νόμον καὶ δικαιώματα" (p. 228).

Mr. Green infers that we cannot safely conclude "that the Apostle never uses the anarthrous word to signify the Jewish Law." "But," he adds, "it would scarcely be too hardy an assumption, that the *Apostle has been precise with respect to the Article in those passages of his writings where any ambiguity was undesirable.*"

This uncertain mode of speaking virtually abandons many passages to the caprice, or preconceived opinions of individual Commentators. It will be made clear by a few examples that the question can hardly be said to have been as yet expressly and finally settled.

Dean Alford writes on Rom. ii. 12 ff. "*Nōmos throughout* signifies the law of Moses, even though anarthrous, in every place except where the absence of the Article corresponds to a *logical* indefiniteness, as e. g. ἐαυτοῖς εἰσὼν νόμος, v. 14 : and even there not "*a law*" : see note." The note on v. 14 is, '*are to themselves* (so far) *the law*, not '*a law*, &c.'

Again, on ii. 13 (*οἱ ἀκροαταὶ νόμου*), "*vōmos* was indisputably the law of Moses."

These statements seem directly opposed to Mr. Green's view of the effect produced by omission of the Article. They are equally opposed to Dr. Vaughan's careful distinction of *vōmos*

and ὁ νόμος in his notes on Rom. ii. 12-15.

Bp. Ellicott in his Commentary on Galatians adopted Dean Alford's view, while Bp. Lightfoot agrees with Mr. Green, Dr. Westcott, and Dr. Vaughan. Thus on ii. 19, διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀνέβαο, Bp. Ellicott writes (in 1854) "The real difficulty in these words rests on the meaning of νόμος: this must be decided on exegetical grounds, for it appears most certain that νόμος may be anarthrous, and still clearly mean the law of Moses: see Winer, 'Gr.' § 8." Accordingly the Bishop adds that "Νόμος in each case has the same meaning; that meaning is the Mosaic law."

Bishop Lightfoot, on the contrary, writes on the same passage: "The written law—the Old Testament—is always ὁ νόμος. At least it seems never to be quoted otherwise. Νόμος without the Article is 'law' considered as a principle, exemplified no doubt chiefly and signally in the Mosaic law, but very much wider than this in its application."

The same difference runs throughout the two Commentaries on Galatians, as may be seen by referring to the notes on iii. 18; iv. 4, 5; v. 18; vi. 13. Also on Philipp. iii. 5, κατὰ νόμου Φαρισαῖος, Bp. Ellicott's note is, 'in respect of the law (of Moses) a pharisee. "Νόμος is here the 'Mosaic law,' &c.": while Bp. Lightfoot writes: "νόμον] law' not 'the law'; for though the Mosaic law is meant, it is here regarded in the abstract as a principle of action, being co-ordinated with ζῆλος and δικαιοσύνην.' See below, p. 47.

When opinions so distinctly opposite are so strongly maintained on either side, it is reasonable to suppose that some further investigation of the facts of the case is necessary. We propose therefore to examine the usage of the word νόμος, with and without the Article (i.) in the Septuagint, (ii.) in the New Testament generally, and (iii.) in St. Paul's Epistles.

i. USAGE IN THE SEPTUAGINT. As Tromm's Concordance to the LXX is notoriously imperfect, we shall endeavour to supplement its deficiencies from the excellent Hebrew Concordance of Fürst.

We may first observe that the word (נֹוָם), of which νόμος is the usual rendering, has a very wide range of meaning. According to Fürst it means "doctrine, instruction, teaching paternal and Divine; hence the whole Mosaic law, and also the whole word of God, both law and ordinances, then the law specially, and particular laws and precepts, then metaphorically system and method (2 Sam. vii. 19)."

For an instance of the more general sense of the word we may refer to the note in this Commentary on Mic. iv. 2, "for the law shall go forth of Zion." "Rather, for out of Zion shall go forth a law. The Hebrew word for law literally signifies *instruction*. The old law is not what is here meant, but the fulfilment of it (Matt. v. 17, 18), the teaching of Christ."

Another point to be noticed is that in regard to the use of the Article the Septuagint follows the Hebrew very closely.

Thus the word νόμος is used to translate נֹוָם about 187 times, and only in about six passages do the Hebrew and the Greek differ as to the insertion or omission of the Article. In four of these places (Prov. xxviii. 4 (twice), xxi. 18, Isai. xxiv. 5) the LXX have *improperly inserted* it, as is well explained by Delitzsch in his note on Isai. xxiv. 5: "Understanding the earth as we do in a general sense, 'the law' cannot signify merely the positive law of Israel. The Gentile world had also a *Torah* or divine teaching within, which contained an abundance of divine directions (*tōrōth*)."<sup>1</sup> With this view agree Jerome, Aben-Esra, Vitringa, Rosenmüller.

In Mal. ii. 8, 9 (ἐν νόμῳ) the LXX have not heard the Article in נֹוָם.

Nor does this close agreement imply a departure from the general use of the Article in Greek: for "in Hebrew the Article is employed with a Noun to limit its application in nearly the same cases as in Greek or German (or English), namely, only when a *definite* object, one previously mentioned, or already known, or the only one of its kind, is the subject of discourse" (Gesenius, 'Hebrew Grammar,' § 109).

## INTRODUCTION.

Of the 187 passages above mentioned δένόμος is used in 120 with other defining words which render the Article necessary. These examples need no discussion.

The same may be said of five other passages, in which τοῦ νόμου is dependent on a Noun which has the Article, either τὸ βιβλίον or τὸς λόγος (2 Ki. xxii. 11, xxiii. 24, 2 Chr. xxxiv. 19; Neh. viii. 3, 9); and in one passage 2 Ki. xxii. 8, βιβλίον τοῦ νόμου εὑρον, where τοῦ νόμου seems to be dependent on an anarthrous Noun, the Article before βιβλίον has been *improperly* omitted by the LXX from a literal adherence to the Hebrew, in which the antecedent Noun is in the construct state and therefore without the Article.

In eight passages (2 Chr. xxxi. 21; Ezra vii. 10; x. 3; Neh. viii. 2, 7; x. 34, 36; xiii. 3) δένόμος has the Article because "the Law of Moses" is meant, i. e. the Pentateuch as a whole, or possibly in Ezra x. 3 the particular law about the marriage of Priests. In Jer. ii. 8 (יְהוָה שֶׁמֶן קַרְבָּן) the LXX have added μον unnecessary. In Zeph. iii. 4 Tromm reads ἀσεβοῦσιν εἰς τὸν νόμον, but Field has ἀσεβοῦσιν νόμον, which agrees with the Hebrew.

Adding the four passages above mentioned in which the LXX have improperly inserted the Article, we have 140 passages in which δένόμος occurs, and out of these there are only eight, in which, without some further definition, it stands for "the Law" of Moses. In fact it is only in the later books 2 Kings, 2 Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, that this limited sense of "the Law" is found.

It remains for us now to examine the forty-seven passages in which νόμος is used without the Article.

In twenty of these passages νόμος is followed by a Genitive defining the giver of the law Κυρίου, Θεοῦ, τοῦ Θεοῦ, Μωϋσέως, μον.

In three other passages (Neh. ix. 13; Mal. ii. 6; Prov. xiii. 15) νόμος, followed by a Genitive, has a perfectly general sense "a law of truth," "a wise man's instruction."

In three passages νόμῳ is found with

the Preposition ἐν, 2 Chr. xv. 3, ἐν οὐ νόμῳ, where it is perfectly indefinite, and Mal. ii. 8, 9 ἐν νόμῳ, on which see above, p. 43.

In two passages the genitive νόμου depending on an anarthrous Noun seems at first sight to mean definitely "the law."

But in the first of these passages 2 Chr. xxxiv. 15, βιβλίον νόμου, the LXX have been again misled, as in 2 Ki. xxii. 8, by the omission in Hebrew of the Article before the Noun in the construct state: there they wrote βιβλίον τοῦ νόμου, here more consistently βιβλίον νόμου, while in both passages τό βιβλίον τοῦ νόμου would have been the right rendering.

In the other passage, Prov. vi. 23, λύχνος ἐντολὴ νόμου καὶ φῶς is a mis-translation of the Hebrew, which means a "commandment is a lamp, and instruction (Torâh) is light," the Articles being wrongly inserted in the A. V. See Delitzsch on the passage, and at p. 42 of his Commentary on Proverbs: "In vain do we look for the name Israel in the Proverbs, even the name Torâh has a much more flexible idea attached to it than that of the law written at Sinai: compare xxviii. 4; xxix. 18, with xxviii. 7; xiii. 14, &c."

In four of the remaining nineteen passages we find νόμος εἰς, which needs no remark. In three more (Deut. xxxiii. 3; Neh. ix. 14; Isai. li. 4) the A. V. renders νόμος rightly without the Definite Article. In twelve passages (Prov. xxviii. 7, 9; Isai. ii. 3; viii. 16, 20; Jer. xviii. 18; Lam. ii. 9; Ezek. vii. 26; Mic. iv. 2; Hab. i. 4; Hagg. ii. 11; Mal. ii. 7) the meaning is indefinite, "instruction" or "law," and the Article is wrongly inserted in the A. V., not being found in the Hebrew.

We thus arrive at the general result that νόμος, without the Article, and without some defining Genitive, never means "the law" of Moses as a definite whole.

This result is confirmed by the twenty-two passages in which νόμος, with or without the Article, is found in the Apocrypha.

When it means definitely "the law," it either takes the Article (Ecclesiasticus xlix. 4; 2 Macc. iv. 17; vii. 9; Sus. v. 62) or is followed by a defining Genitive or

Relative (Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 23; xxxix. 1, 8; xl. 8; xlii. 2; xliv. 20; xlv. 17; xlvi. 14).

In seven passages (Ecclesiasticus xxxii. 15, 24; xxxiii. 2, 3; xxxiv. 8; xxxv. 1; xlv. 5) the general meaning (Divine instruction, a precept, a law) is evident.

In 1 Macc. ii. 21 (*καταλιπεῖν νόμον καὶ δικαιώματα*), the passage quoted by Mr. Green, the omission of the Articles may be explained by the principle of "enumeration" (Winer, p. 149, note 2; Middleton p. 99), or we may very properly retain the literal rendering ("to forsake law and ordinances"), thus bringing out into prominence the inherent force of the ideas. The three remaining passages (1 Macc. x. 37; xi. 34, 57) have no bearing on the question before us.

## ii. USAGE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT GENERALLY.

When we turn to the New Testament, we find that in the Gospels *vόμος* occurs thirty-two times, and has the Article in all except three passages. In Luke ii. 23, 24 ἐν νόμῳ Κυρίου, the Article is omitted either because a particular law is meant (Ex. xiii. 12; Lev. xii. 6), or more probably on account of the anarthrous *Kύριον*, as frequently in the LXX.

In Joh. xix. 7 ("We have a law") *vόμον* refers indefinitely either to the whole law, or to the particular law Lev. xxiv. 16,—*indefinitely* because the speakers do not assume that it was previously known to Pilate, or else to draw attention to the authoritative character of the code, as *law* which ought to be carried out.

These three exceptions in no way affect the truth of Origen's rule when applied to the Gospels, that when the law of Moses is meant the Article is always used (*ὁ νόμος*). We also observe in the Gospels that *ὁ νόμος*, without further definition, has become the recognised title of the Mosaic Law, or Pentateuch.

In Acts *ὁ νόμος* occurs nineteen times, *νόμος* only once xiii. 39 (*ἐν νόμῳ Μωϋσέως*), where the defining Genitive renders the Article unnecessary.

In the Epistle of St. James the word is found ten times. Twice only (ii. 9, 10) it means "the law" of Moses as a whole, and has the Article.

In three passages the omission of the Article brings out emphatically the character of the particular law meant as "*a perfect law*" (i. 25), *a royal law*" (ii. 8), "*a law of liberty*" (ii. 12).

In the five remaining instances, ii. 11, and iv. 11, where *νόμος* recurs four times, it is to be rendered simply "law" as in the perfectly similar passage Rom. ii. 25, where see note.

## iii. USAGE IN ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES.

Before proceeding to examine St. Paul's usage of the word, let us remind ourselves that the question is whether *νόμος* without the Article is ever used, like *ὁ νόμος*, simply as a Proper Name of "the law" of Moses. We have found no such use in the LXX, Apocrypha, Gospels, Acts, or Catholic Epistles. Is it to be found in St. Paul?

The best mode of answering the question will be to classify the uses of the word first in other Epistles, and then separately in Romans.

In St. Paul's Epistles, other than Romans, the word occurs forty-seven times, not including 1 Cor. vii. 39, where *νόμῳ* is interpolated.

(1) *ὁ νόμος*. In eighteen passages it has the Article 1 Cor. ix. 8, 9; xiv. 21, 34; xv. 56; Gal. iii. 10, 12, 13, 17, 19, 21, 24; iv. 21; v. 3, 14; vi. 2 (*τ. ν. τοῦ Χριστοῦ*); Eph. ii. 15; 1 Tim. i. 8.

In all these passages it means the *law of Moses*, except in Gal. vi. 2, and probably 1 Cor. xiv. 21.

(2) *νόμος*. (a) In three passages it is evidently, from the form of the sentence, indefinite: Gal. iii. 21, *εἰ γὰρ ἤδοθη νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος κ. τ. λ. v. 23, κατὰ τῶν τοιότων οὐκ ἔστι νόμος* (a quotation from Aristotle: see note on Rom. ii. 14), 1 Tim. i. 9, *δικαιῷ νόμος οὐ κεῖται*.

(b) In six passages we have the phrase *ἔχει ψήφων νόμον* (Gal. ii. 16, thrice; iii. 2, 5, 10), on the meaning of which see our note on Rom. iii. 20, and Bp. Lightfoot on Gal. iii. 10.

On this point we refer with pleasure to Mr. S. C. Green's excellent 'Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament,'

## INTRODUCTION.

p. 218; "Rom. iii. 20: ἵξ ἔργων νόμου κ. τ. λ., by deeds of law shall no flesh be justified, for by law is the knowledge of sin."

The omission of the Article shows the truth to be universal, applicable to all men, and to every form of law. Compare v. 28; Gal. ii. 16; iii. 2, 5, 10, in all which passages the Article is consistently omitted."

St. Paul's work would have been but half done, if he had only proved that man could not be justified by the *works of the Law of Moses*. What he has proved, and what gives to his Epistle its eternal significance is that by *no works of law*, by no legal obedience, can man in any age or nation earn for himself righteousness before God: if he could, Christ's death was needless (Gal. ii. 21).

(c) In Gal. ii. 19, *νόμῳ ἀπέθανον*, the law of Moses is regarded in its nature as "law": non quia Mosis, sed quia lex. "I died to law," as a principle of justification.

In Gal. vi. 13, *οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι αὐτὸι νόμου φυλάσσονται*, the meaning is that the circumcisionists, who enforce the particular ordinance, are not themselves in the full and true sense "*doers of law*," because they omit "*the weightier matters of the law—judgment, mercy, and faith*." In both passages the absence of the Article gives prominence to the general idea "law," and the Apostle's thought gains breadth and force by the more exact rendering.

In the remaining eighteen passages *νόμος* without the Article is governed by a Preposition δι, ἐξ, ἐν, κατά, ἵπο: i Cor. ix. 20 (four times); Gal. ii. 19, 21; iii. 11, 18, 21, 23; iv. 4, 5, 21; v. 4, 18; Philipp. iii. 5, 6, 9.

The notion that in these passages *νόμος* is anarthrous simply because it is governed by a Preposition has nothing in its favour: it is opposed to the constant usage of the LXX, Apocrypha, and Gospels, in none of which (as we have seen above) is there a single passage where *νόμος* meaning "the law" of Moses loses its Article on account of being governed by a Preposition, except where the LXX overlooked the presence of the Article in the

Hebrew. On the other hand in every passage where the Article is omitted, the context not only admits the exact rendering "law" but gains by it a more forcible and comprehensive meaning.

As a crucial test we may take the passage Rom. iii. 31, *νόμον οὖν καταργοῦμεν διὰ τῆς πιστεώς; μη γένοιτο, ἀλλὰ νόμον ιστάνομεν*. Dean Alford's note is as follows: "νόμος not 'law' but 'the law,' as everywhere in the Epistle. We may safely say that the Apostle never argues of law, abstract, in the sense of a system of precepts—its attributes or its effects—but always of THE LAW, concrete,—the law of God given by Moses, when speaking of the Jews, as here: the law of God, in as far as written on their consciences, when speaking of the Gentiles."

Can we really believe that St. Paul meant, what is thus attributed to him, "we establish THE LAW," concrete, the law of God given by Moses to the Jews? Before answering, let the reader study what St. Paul had written a few months before to the Galatians (ii. 18) with Dean Alford's own commentary upon it:

"*If I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor.*" The force of the verse is—You, by now re-asserting the obligation of the law, are proving (*quoad te*) that your former step of setting aside the law was in fact a transgression of it."

It appears inconceivable that St. Paul, after this, should say "we establish the law," but it is perfectly natural that he should say, "we do not annul, nay we establish, law in its true character and essential nature as a revelation of the holy will of God," which can be fulfilled only through faith in Christ (viii. 4). See our notes on the passage.

We proceed to classify the various uses of *νόμος* in the Epistle to the Romans.

I. We find ὁ *νόμος* about thirty-five times, sometimes in a tropical sense (as in vii. 21, 23; viii. 2), but usually meaning the law of Moses.

II. In about forty passages *νόμος* is without the Article, and its meanings may be classified as follows:—

(a) *νόμος "law"* in a tropical sense, "a ruling principle."

- Rom. ii. 14, ἔντοις εἰσιν νόμος.  
 „ iii. 27, διὰ νόμου πίστεως.  
 „ vii. 23, ἔτερον νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέ-  
     λεσί μον.  
 „ 25, νόμῳ ἀμαρτίας.  
 ix. 31, νόμον δικαιοσύνης.  
 „ „ εἰς νόμον [δικαιοσύνης].

No one could think of applying these passages to the Law of Moses.

(b) *nόμος* "law" in an unlimited sense, in negative or interrogative sentences.

- iii. 27, διὰ ποίου νόμου;  
 iv. 15, οὐ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος.  
 v. 13, μὴ ὄντος νόμου.

To these passages we cannot hesitate to add

- ii. 14, τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα.  
 „ „ οὐτοὶ νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες.

See the notes on this verse.

(c) In another class of passages the omission of the Article brings into prominence the nature of "law" as a general principle:

- ii. 17, ἐπαναπαύν γόμῳ.  
 „ 25, ἐὰν νόμον πράσσῃς.  
 „ „ ἐὰν δὲ παραβάτης νόμου οὐ.  
 „ 27, παραβάτην νόμου.  
 iii. 31, νόμον οὖν καταργοῦμεν;  
 „ „ ἀλλὰ νόμον ιστάνομεν.  
 v. 20, νόμος δὲ παρευσθῆνεν.  
 vii. 1, γηγνώσκουσι γὰρ νόμον λαλῶ.  
 vii. 2, ἀνδρὶ δέδεται νόμῳ.  
 x. 4, τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστός.  
 xiii. 8, νόμον πεπλήρωκεν.  
 „ 10, πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη.

After carefully studying these passages we shall feel no doubt that the same general idea of "law" is to be found in the following passages:

- ii. 12, οἵτις ἐν νόμῳ ἤμαρτον.  
 διὰ νόμου κριθήσονται.  
 ii. 23, οἵτις ἐν νόμῳ κανχάσαι.  
 iii. 20, διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἀμαρ-  
     τίας.  
 iii. 21, χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη πεφα-  
     νέρωται.  
 iv. 13, οὐ γὰρ διὰ νόμου ἡ ἐπαγγελία.  
 iv. 14, οἱ ἐκ νόμου.  
 v. 13, ἀχρι γὰρ νόμου ἀμαρτία ḥν.  
 vi. 14, οὐ γάρ ἔστε ὑπὸ νόμου.  
 „ 15, οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑπὸ νόμου.

vii. 7, ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων εἰ μὴ διὰ  
 νόμου.

„ 8, χωρὶς γὰρ νόμου ἀμαρτία νεκρά.  
 „ 9, ἔζων χωρὶς νόμου ποτέ.

iii. 20, ἐξ ἐργων νόμου οὐδὲ δικαιωθήσεται  
 „ 28, χωρὶς ἐργων νόμου.  
 ix. 32, ὡς ἐξ ἐργων [νόμου].

In the only remaining passage vii. 25, οὐδὲ δουλεύω νόμῳ Θεοῦ, we might explain the omission of the Article as in Luke ii. 23, but the antithesis νόμῳ ἀμαρτίας shows that the proper rendering is "a law of God" "a divine law." See note.

In this last class (c) are found the passages, which have been thought to prove most certainly that *nόμος* is used indifferently with ὁ *nόμος* as a Proper Name for "the Law" of Moses.

For a more correct interpretation we must refer to the foot-notes on each passage.

We may however refer here to one or two passages in which, at first sight, it may seem difficult to maintain the correct translation of the indefinite *nόμος*.

In Phil. iii. 5, κατὰ νόμου Φαρισαῖος (cited above, p. 43), if we introduce the definite sense "the Law," we should be obliged to include the Oral Law, for it was the fundamental principle of the Pharisees to make the Oral Law as binding as the written Law of Moses. The real meaning however is that St. Paul had been as strict as any Pharisee "in regard to law," because he had looked upon law as the principle of justification before God.

In 1 Cor. ix. 20, τοῖς ὑπὸ νόμου ὡς  
 ὑπὸ νόμου, μὴ ὡν αὐτὸς ὑπὸ νόμου, St. Paul's meaning is that he was not, like the unconverted Jews, "under law" as a condition of righteousness. In no other sense could he say that he was not himself under the law, unless the law were limited to the Ceremonial as distinct from the Moral Law.

But can we adopt this distinction? Can we say that St. Paul's expression, "Ye are not under the law, but under grace," applies only to the Ceremonial and not to the Moral Law? It is clearly impossible. For what is the example

## INTRODUCTION.

chosen by the Apostle to prove that we are delivered from the Law? It is no outward ordinance, no ceremonial observance, but a moral precept, the deep heart-searching principle of moral obedience. "*Thou shalt not covet*" (Rom. vii. 7, μὴ ἐπιθυμήσεις). This is the law of which St. Paul says that it wrought in him all manner of concupiscence, and that sin took occasion by it, and slew him. How could these deadly effects result from the moral law which is holy just and good, ordained to life, except from its being perversely regarded as a means of earning justification, which its nature as law forbids?

Lastly, as the best apology for a long discussion, we will quote the weighty words of Bp. Lightfoot, "on a fresh Revision of the New Testament," p. 99. "The distinction between *vόμος* and *δένδρος* is very commonly disregarded, and yet it is full of significance. Behind the concrete representation—the Mosaic law itself—St. Paul sees an imperious principle, an overwhelming presence, antagonistic to grace, to liberty, to spirit, and (in some aspects) even to life—abstract law, which, though the Mosaic ordinances are its most signal and complete embodiment, nevertheless is not exhausted therein, but exerts its crushing power over the conscience in diverse manifestations. The one—the concrete and special—is *δένδρος*; the other—the abstract and universal—is *vόμος*. To the full understanding of such passages as Rom. ii. 12 sq., iii. 19 sq., iv. 13 sq., vii. 1 sq., Gal. iii. 10 sq., and indeed to an adequate conception of the leading idea of St. Paul's doctrine of law and grace, this distinction is indispensable."

We will only add that "law" assumes this form of an imperious principle opposed to grace and liberty only when it is viewed as the condition of justification, the means of attaining to righteousness before God through the merit of good works. Viewed according to its true idea as the expression of God's will, and the guide of man's obedience, it "is holy, just, and good," "spiritual," and "ordained to life" (vii. 10, 12, 14).

## THE FLESH.

The word "flesh" (*σάρξ*) occurs twenty-eight times in Romans, and frequently in St. Paul's other Epistles, especially Galatians: it has various meanings which must be carefully distinguished, if we wish to have a clear understanding of the Apostle's teaching in many important passages. The inquiry has been made more necessary by the efforts of recent writers to show that St. Paul's use of the words "flesh" and "spirit" agrees not so much with the Old Testament as with the dualism of the Greek philosophy of his age.

This view of St. Paul's doctrine of "the Flesh" is adopted with various modifications by Holsten, R. Schmidt, Lüdemann, and Pfleiderer. Their several views are briefly stated and compared by Wendt in a good monograph "Die Begriffe: Fleisch und Geist;" Pfleiderer's views are contained in his "Paulinism," pp. 35–67. We can only notice the chief points of the theory.

The Finite and the Infinite, Man and God, are said to be conceived by St. Paul as "Flesh" and "Spirit." These are contrasted first in a physical sense.

"Flesh" is the earthly, material, living substance of man's body; even the "soul" (*ψυχή*) is included in the "flesh," being the vitality or animating force of its earthly matter. The antithesis to "flesh" is "spirit," a higher material but not earthly substance, belonging exclusively to the Divine nature, and having as its essential characteristic a life-giving force. According to one view (Holsten's) the whole man is made up of "flesh": "spirit" forms no part of his nature, but is simply transcendental and Divine (Wendt, pp. 80, 86).

"Flesh," in its physical aspect, is weak, transient and *perishable*: in the intellectual world it is the principle of *error*: in the sphere of morals, it is the principle of *evil*, and here it comes into direct conflict with "spirit," as an opposing force (*ib.* p. 81).

"Thus from the opposition of physically different substances, as set forth in 1 Cor. xv. results the dualism of antagonistic moral principles" (Pfleiderer, i. p. 54).

"Flesh and Spirit both are to Paul not inert but active substances (Rom. viii. 5 ff.). The flesh works as sensual desire, the spirit as non-sensual will" (Holsten, 'Das Evangelium d. Paulus,' p. 127).

This idea of the "flesh" is supposed to pervade St. Paul's system of doctrine: it explains his view of the Law, of Sin, of Christ's Person and work.

(1) Disregarding the ceremonial ordinances as having reference only to the "flesh," he recognises the Moral Law as spiritual and divine.

(2) Sin has its natural source in the "flesh," which is in itself unholy, in opposition to "spirit" which is holy. But the sin thus actually grounded in man's nature (*ἀμαρτία*) is at first unconscious and guiltless, and is thus distinguished from conscious transgression (*παράβασις*). Indwelling sin is thus a real though unconscious tendency of the "flesh" to strive against the "spirit," and the spiritual law, and thus it inevitably and of necessity produces conscious transgression and the sense of guilt (*ib.* p. 82).

(3) Christ even in His pre-existent state is regarded as man, the heavenly spiritual man: His "flesh" belongs not to His permanent Being, but only to His earthly life.

Sin (*ἀμαρτία*, not *παράβασις*) dwelt in His flesh as in that of other men: and hence the indwelling power of sin was destroyed in the destruction of the earthly substance of His flesh.

The "new life" of believers consists in the gift of the Divine spirit whereby they appropriate and realise in their own persons this effect of Christ's death, by continually subduing the flesh to the spirit, a process which will be perfected only in the end of the world, when matter, in its grosser form, will be wholly overpowered by spirit (*ib.* p. 83).

It is evident even from this brief and imperfect sketch that in this so-called Pauline doctrine we have quite "another gospel," and not that which St. Paul has been usually supposed to preach. The theory, in all the various forms under which it is presented, is mainly founded upon the assumption that St. Paul regards the "flesh" as essentially sinful.

It thus involves the necessary consequence that our Blessed Lord not only bare "*the likeness of sinful flesh*," but that His flesh itself was sinful: see note on viii. 3.

It will not then be thought a needless labour if we try to ascertain what meaning the Apostle really attached to a word so important in his teaching as "the flesh."

1. In its original and proper meaning *σάρξ* denotes the material of the living body, whether of man or of other animals, as in Lev. xvii. 11.

In this sense it occurs in ii. 28, "*circumcision, which is outward in the flesh*": compare Bp. Lightfoot's note on Col. i. 22, "*in the body of his flesh*." It must be observed that in xiv. 21, "*to eat flesh*," the Greek word is not *σάρξ* but *κρέας*, which means dead flesh, a distinction rightly observed by the LXX in translating the Hebrew word (*בשר*) which means flesh either dead or living.

2. In the common Hebrew phrase "*all flesh*" (Gen. vi. 12, 13, 19; vii. 21) all earthly living things are included with man, except where the context limits the meaning to mankind (Job xii. 10; Ps. lxx. 2; Joel. ii. 28). In Rom. iii. 20, *οὐδὲ δικαιοθήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ*, a quotation from Ps. cxliii. 2, St. Paul has substituted "*no flesh*" for "*no man living*," and the change may have been made on purpose to strengthen the contrast between man, in his imperfect nature, and the God before whom he stands.

3. "*Flesh*" is applied by St. Paul to human kindred, as in ix. 3, "*my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh*;" xi. 14, "*my flesh*." This usage, like the preceding, is derived from the Old Testament: see Gen. xxxvii. 27, "*he is our brother, and our flesh*." We cannot see that it necessarily implies, as Wendt supposes, p. 159, a *contrast* between the merely human relation, and the relation of man to God, or between "*flesh*" and "*spirit*." The nature derived by kinsmen from a common ancestor is simply described by that part of it which is visible and palpable.

In ix. 8, on the other hand, there is an express contrast made between "*the*

## INTRODUCTION.

*children of the flesh*" and "*the children of the promise*," equivalent to the contrast in Gal. iv. 29 between him "*that was born after the flesh*" and "*him that was born after the Spirit*."

In iv. 1, where Abraham is called "*our forefather according to the flesh*," a similar contrast seems to be implied between a merely natural and a spiritual relation.

In neither passage however does the contrast, expressed or implied, involve a judgment upon the *moral* quality of "*the flesh*," but it is distinguished from "*the Spirit*," as that which is *merely* natural from that which is above nature.

In this usage  $\sigma\alpha\rho\xi$  represents man's purely natural, earthly condition, a condition in which he is subject to infirmity, suffering, and death, subject also to the temptations which work through the senses and their appetites, but not originally and essentially sinful.

It is in this sense that Christ is said in i. 3 to have been "*made of the seed of David as to the flesh*," and in ix. 5 to have sprung "*as concerning the flesh*," from Israel. In both passages  $\sigma\alpha\rho\xi$  denotes what was simply and solely natural in his earthly life.

4. Though "*the flesh*" is not essentially sinful, it is essentially weak, and hence the word is used to describe man in his weakness, physical, intellectual, or moral.

As connoting mere physical weakness  $\sigma\alpha\rho\xi$  is found in several passages of St. Paul's Epistles (2 Cor. iv. 11 - vii. 5; xii. 7; Gal. ii. 20; iv. 13) but not in Romans. We may remark that such a passage as Gal. ii. 20, "*the life that I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God*," is decisive against the notion that "*flesh*" is something essentially sinful.

Yet mere physical weakness of the flesh may be a hindrance to man's spirit, as in Matt. xxvii. 41, "*the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak*;" and the human spirit thus hampered by the weakness of the flesh is so far unfitted to be the organ of the Spirit of God.

This opposition of "*the flesh*" to all that is spiritual is more clearly marked, when "*the flesh*" is regarded as the

cause of *intellectual* weakness: this is the case in Rom. vi. 19, "*I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh*," a passage which should be compared with 1 Cor. ii. 14, iii. 1.

5. Before we proceed to examine the passages in which St. Paul speaks of "*the flesh*" in its *ethical* quality as affected by sin ( $\sigma\alpha\rho\xi \ \delta\mu\alpha\pi\tau\alpha\varsigma$ ), it will be desirable to notice how those who would prove that the Apostle regards "*the flesh*" as essentially sinful endeavour to remove the obstacle presented by Rom. v. 12 to the acceptance of their theory.

It is admitted by Pfleiderer ('Paulinism,' p. 45) that the words *sin entered into the world* "undoubtedly imply the entrance of something new, which consequently did not previously exist at all," and therefore "it is quite out of place to introduce here the doctrine of the  $\sigma\alpha\rho\xi$  as the *natural* principle of sin, for this passage expressly exhibits the principle of sin *not* as natural, but as of *historical origin*."

This evident meaning of Rom. v. 12 is admitted to be inconsistent with the doctrine attributed to St. Paul in Rom. vii., that "*the flesh*" is originally and by its own nature, prior to the first man's transgression, the principle of sin. But instead of regarding this *formal contradiction* as a reason for doubting his own view of the doctrine in Rom. vii., Pfleiderer finds in it a reason for setting aside what he has already admitted to be the unquestionable meaning of v. 12: "If we are compelled to confess that there is a *formal contradiction* between Rom. v. 12 f. and Paul's doctrine of the sinful  $\sigma\alpha\rho\xi$ , we are all the more justified in penetrating through the obvious form of the doctrine in Rom. v. 12 f. to the speculative idea embodied in it, which is so plainly suggested by the actual words of Paul, where he identifies the act of Adam with the common act of all. So soon as we grasp the thought that it was not in truth the first man as an individual who was the subject of the fall, but man as man, we see the historical beginning to be merely the form which expresses the universality of the principle which has no beginning; and thus the sub-

stantial agreement of the passage with the line of thought in Rom. vii. is placed beyond doubt."

Before we can consent thus to set aside the obvious and acknowledged sense of Rom. v. 12 in favour of a "speculative idea" altogether contradictory to "the Jewish theological doctrine" (Pfleiderer, p. 46), we ought to be fully convinced that the proposed interpretation of the Apostle's line of thought in Rom. vii. is at least as obvious and as certain, as his meaning in Rom. v. 12 is acknowledged to be. In other words, it ought to be shown that in Rom. vii. "*the flesh*" is distinctly declared to be originally and in its own nature sinful, and that no other interpretation is admissible.

We proceed to examine this point.

In vii. 5, "*when we were in the flesh*" St. Paul speaks as one who is "*in the flesh*" no longer: "*the flesh*" therefore cannot here mean the material substance of the body *per se*, nor this earthly bodily state *per se*, but only as subject to some quality formerly attached to it, namely, as the context shows, a predominant sinful propensity. This quality is therefore accidental and separable, and not of the essence of "*the flesh*" considered as the material substance of the body: and so St. Paul can write "*the life that I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God*" (Gal. ii. 20), a passage which, as clearly as Rom. vii. 5, refutes the notion that "*the flesh*," i.e. the material living substance of the body, is essentially sinful.

The next passage in which the word occurs is vii. 18, "*For I know that in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing.*" Here not only is the moral weakness and worthlessness of "*the flesh*" asserted in the strongest possible terms, but the utter absence of good is alleged as evidence of something worse than weakness, of positive indwelling sin (v. 17).

"*The flesh*" then is regarded by St. Paul as a dwelling-place, and seat, not necessarily the only seat, of sin: but it is important to observe that his judgment is the result of practical experience (*oīda*), not of any speculative analysis

of the ideas of "*flesh*" and "*sin*." He found as a fact sin dwelling in his flesh: we may add that he regarded this as a fact of universal experience (iii. 9—20): but we have no reason to suppose that he regarded sin as inseparable from the very essence of "*the flesh*"; we are still far from the conclusion that in the Apostle's mind "*the flesh* is by its nature and from the beginning the principle of sin" (Pfleiderer, p. 62).

We pass on to vii. 25: "*So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.*"

Here the form of the sentence distinguishes "*the flesh*" from "*the sin*" which gives law to it, as clearly as it distinguishes "*the mind*" from God whose law it serves. Sin in fact appears not as an essential property of the flesh, but as a power which has brought it into bondage.

The flesh thus ruled by sin becomes a chief source of opposition, not only to the better impulses of "*the mind*," but also to the law of God and to the influence of His Spirit. Hence it naturally becomes personified; and that which was a mere material substance, morally inert, is invested in the Apostle's thought with a spontaneous energy and a living will, with affections and lusts, that war not only against the soul, but against God, so that "*the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other*" (Gal. v. 17).

It is in this sense that "*the flesh*" is so often mentioned in Rom. viii. as a principle pervading all man's earthly life, and ruling it in opposition to all that is spiritual and Divine: compare the notes on viii. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13; xii. 14: also see the notes on vii. 14 (*σάρκως*) and xv. 27 (*σαρκικός*).

The preceding references include every passage in the Epistle in which *σάρξ* and its derivatives occur. But one of these passages (viii. 3) requires to be further noticed.

Its true interpretation depends on our holding fast the original meaning of "*the flesh*" under every modification to which it is subjected in the Apostle's use. When it is said that the law

## INTRODUCTION.

"was weak through the flesh," we see that St. Paul is regarding "*the flesh*" in that point of view which he has fully explained in vii. 14-25, that is to say, he regards "*the flesh*" not only as morally worthless, devoid of all good (vii. 18), but as positively opposed to the law which is spiritual (*v.* 14), and as exercising such dominion over man's whole life that while the mind consents unto the law that it is good (*v.* 16), the will is not able to give effect to its better impulses, but is forced, as it were, unwillingly to do that which the conscience hates (*v.* 15). Against this controlling power of "*the flesh*" the law was weak.

But God sent his own Son in the likeness of this same flesh, which had in all men become "*flesh of sin*." In our notes on this passage we have fully discussed the meaning of the expression "*likeness of flesh of sin*," and have, as we believe, proved that it does not by any means imply that Christ's own flesh was sinful. It may be well to state the opposite view in the words of one of its most able and moderate advocates : "By means of the *πνεῖμα ἀγωστίνης*, which constituted His personality (Rom. i. 4), Christ was free from personal sin ; not merely from sinful actions, but from any personal inward experience whatsoever of sin as His own : He was one "*who knew no sin*," 2 Cor. v. 21. Notwithstanding this, He partook according to the flesh, or according to His outward man, of the universal human principle of sin, for He had as the material of His body the *same flesh of sin as all other men*" (Pfleiderer, 'Paulinism,' i. 152). This view is further connected, as we might expect, with a theory of Christ's pre-existent nature very different from that which St. Paul is usually supposed to teach. According to Pfleiderer Christ "was essentially and originally a heavenly man" (p. 132). He is the perfect image of God only so far as the Divine essence is "capable of manifestation." "But this being the very image of God is so far from being equal to Him, that on the contrary Christ's Lordship over the community

and the world implies his unconditional subordination to God" (p. 135).

His being "*in the form of God*" (Phil. ii. 6) "by no means implies that He Himself was also God (*Θεὸς ὁ λόγος*) ; on the contrary, the Pauline notion of being in the image of God distinctly includes within itself that of being the pattern of humanity" (p. 138).

In this theory we see one of the necessary results of the writer's misinterpretation of the "*likeness of sinful flesh* :" if Christ's own flesh is assumed to be sinful, we can escape from the intolerable thought that sin was in the Manhood taken into God, only by denying the Godhead of the Son.

On the contrary hold fast throughout, as the same writer frequently insists, that "*the flesh*" is everywhere "*the material substance of the body*" (pp. 48, 49, 57), and be content to combine with this what the same author (p. 52) calls "*the common Hebraic notion of σάρξ*, according to which it signifies material substance which is void indeed of the spirit but not contrary to it, which is certainly weak and perishable, and so far unclean, but not positively evil,"—which in all men except Christ is corrupted and defiled by sin, but is neither sin itself, nor the original source of sin, nor in its essence sinful,—and so we can understand how Christ by taking our flesh in its pure essence without sin, and preserving its sinlessness in every stage of our earthly existence through life and unto death, "*condemned sin in the flesh*," condemned it as having no rightful place or power there, condemned it as an enemy to be by His help conquered and cast out.

The method of interpretation which we have now applied to every passage in which the word *σάρξ* occurs in the Epistle to the Romans is equally applicable to its use in other Epistles, and in the Bible generally. There is not, as we believe, a single passage which contains the doctrine that the flesh is the source of sin and essentially sinful,—a doctrine which dishonours not only man's nature, but the Father who created us, and the Son who for our redemption was made flesh, and dwelt among us.

# THE EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE ROMANS.

## CHAPTER I.

**1** Paul commendeth his calling to the Romans, 9 and his desire to come to them. 16 What his gospel is, and the righteousness which it sheweth. 18 God is angry with all manner of sin. 21 What were the sins of the Gentiles.

### CHAP. I. 1-7. ADDRESS OF THE EPISTLE.

The form of salutation with which St. Paul begins his Epistles, is here enlarged by important statements concerning his Apostolic office, the nature of the Gospel, and the Person of Christ. This stately fulness in the opening address of the Epistle well befits the grandeur of its subject, and the dignity of a Church seated in the Imperial City, to which the writer was as yet unknown.

1. Official designation of the writer. St. Paul's first care, in addressing a church to which he is not personally known, is to shew by what authority he writes.

*servant of Jesus Christ.] Servant of Christ Jesus:* see note at the end of the chapter. The meaning of the title is not to be derived from the condition of the Greek slave: its Hebrew origin is clearly seen when St. James (i. 1) calls himself “*a Servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ.*” In the Old Testament “*servant of God*” or “*servant of Jehovah*” is applied to all worshippers of the true God (Deut. xxxii. 36; 2 Kings x. 23; Dan. iii. 26), but more emphatically to those who are specially called to God's service, as Abraham, Moses, David, and the Prophets, and pre-eminently to the Messiah (Ps. cv. 42; Ex. xiv. 31; Ps. xviii. title; Isai. xlvi. 1; Jer. vii. 25; Zech. iii. 8). See Ewald, ‘History of Israel,’ iii. p. 200, note. In the New Testament the corresponding title, “*servant of Christ*,” is occasionally used of believers in general (1 Cor. vii. 22; Eph. vi. 6); but more frequently apostles love to appropriate to themselves a title so significant of entire devotion to a master who is also their Lord and God (Gal. i. 10; Phil. i. 1; James i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1; Jude 1).

PAUL, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle,<sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup> Acts 13 separated unto the gospel of God,

2 (Which he had promised afore by his prophets in the holy scriptures,) <sup>2</sup>

*called to be an apostle.] A called apostle.* In proof of his authority St. Paul now adds the more special designation of his office: he is an “*apostle*” in the full and proper sense, like the twelve whom Christ so named (Luke vi. 13), and, like them, not self-appointed, nor of man's choosing, but “*called*,” and sent by Christ himself (Gal. i. 1; Acts xxvi. 17, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω σε).

*separated.] Set apart.* The Divine call at Damascus, in which God's electing purpose was accomplished (Gal. i. 15), was the crisis in St. Paul's life which determined his future course: henceforward he was “*a chosen vessel to bear Christ's name before Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel*” (Acts ix. 15; xxii. 14, 15.) Thus he had been for ever “*set apart*” from other men not called to the same office, and from other pursuits, “*unto the gospel of God.*” “*Gospel*” means here the actual announcement, the living utterance of “glad tidings,” not only the facts and doctrines contained in the gospel (see note on Mark i. 1, and 1 Cor. i. 17; Gal. ii. 7; 1 Thess. iii. 2). Here, as in Gal. i. 6, 2 Cor. xi. 4, εὐαγγέλιον is used without the article, because St. Paul would indicate the nature and quality of the Gospel as a Divine message—“good tidings from God.”

2-5. From himself and his office St. Paul passes on, with thoughts kindling and expanding at the mention of the Gospel, to declare its relation to ancient prophecy (v. 2), and its great subject, the Son of God, in His Incarnation (v. 3),

His Resurrection and Lordship (v. 4), and His manifestation to the world through His Apostles (v. 5).

2, 3. The connection with the previous

**3** Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the

seed of David according to the flesh;

verse must not be interrupted by brackets, as in the Authorised Version: both sense and construction flow on—"the glad tidings of God which he promised concerning His Son."

The prophets foretell both the publication of the Gospel and its contents: "*the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem*" (Mic. iv. 2), "*O Jerusalem, that bringest good tidings, lift up thy voice with strength!*" (Isai. xl. 9), "*How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace!*" (Isai. lxi. 7; Nah. i. 15). These are but a few out of many passages which foretell the future proclamation of a message from God, apart from any description of its contents. But St. Paul not only seeks to enhance the majesty of the Gospel as thus heralded by prophecy; he also calls God's chief ambassadors "*his prophets*," as witnesses to the truth of its contents.

For in vv. 3, 4 he brings forward two historic facts of paramount importance, which identify the Son concerning whom glad tidings were promised with Jesus whom Paul preaches. The prophets speak of One who *is to be* born of the seed of David (Ps. lxxxix. 36; Jer. xxiii. 5), and *is to be* raised from the dead (Ps. ii. 7; xvi. 10; Acts ii. 25-32; xiii. 32-37); the Gospel tells of Him who *was* born and *was* raised. That these two facts form the very foundation of St. Paul's teaching is clear from this passage and 2 Tim. ii. 8: "*Remember Jesus Christ raised from the dead, of the seed of David, according to my gospel.*" Compare Acts xiii. 23, 30.

*in the holy Scriptures.] In holy scriptures* (Wyclif). The books of the Prophets are "holy writings," being the records of Divine revelation. Compare xvi. 26.

*Concerning his Son.]* The essence of the Gospel, as divinely imparted to St. Paul (Gal. i. 16) and preached by him (2 Cor. i. 19), was the revelation of "the Son of God," "his own Son" (viii. 3, compare viii. 32, *ἰδίον*, and Col. i. 13-17; Phil. ii. 6). St. Paul seems never to have applied the title "Son of God" to Christ in any other than the highest sense, certainly not here, where the Son of God is declared to be the one great subject of the Gospel and of Prophecy. See on v. 4.

*which was made, &c.]* In order to fulfil that which had been promised concerning Him, the Eternal Son must both become the Son of Man and be manifested as the Son of God. For this cause He "*was made, or born, of the seed of David;*" an expression which points to Christ's human birth "as derived

from the greatest of Israel's kings, and in fulfilment of the sure word of prophecy" (Ellicott, 2 Tim. ii. 8). Compare John vii. 42, "*Hath not the Scripture said, that Christ cometh of the seed of David?*" Meyer, Reuss, and others try to represent St. Paul's words as inconsistent with the supernatural generation of Jesus. But that Mary, as well as Joseph, was of the lineage of David is clearly implied in the history of the Annunciation, recorded by St. Paul's constant companion, St. Luke, ch. i. 31-35: see note there. Thus, while Jesus was the Son of David according to the customary and legal view, "*being as was supposed the son of Joseph,*" He was at the same time, by actual descent, "*of the fruit of David's body*" (Ps. cxxxii. 11, 12).

Into these distinctions, however, St. Paul does not here enter: he states that which is everywhere regarded as a notorious fact in the Gospel history, that Jesus "*was descended from David*" (Matt. ix. 27; xv. 22; xx. 30, 31; xxi. 9). See notes on Matt. i. 16, 18.

The importance of St. Paul's testimony to the Davidic descent of Jesus is greatly enhanced by the fact that Gamaliel, at whose feet he was brought up, being grandson of the great Hillel, was himself of the house and lineage of David.

For as Christ must be the Son of David, the first and simplest test of the claims of Jesus was his descent; and this was a matter most easily and surely ascertained by a reference to genealogies so carefully kept as those of the royal family of Judah. Had the slightest shadow of doubt ever been cast upon the descent of Jesus from David, it must have been known to Gamaliel: and his disciple Saul could never have accepted as the Messiah one whose claim to a place in the royal lineage, which Gamaliel shared, was false or doubtful. See Taanith, cap. iv. § 2: "*Rabbi Levi saith: They found a roll of genealogies at Jerusalem, in which was written, Hillel from David.*"

*according to the flesh.] As to the flesh.* The sense is the same as in ch. ix. 5, "*of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came.*" In Gal. iv. 23, 29, the words *καὶ σάρκα, καὶ πνεῦμα, after the flesh, and after the Spirit*, are used in a sense quite different from that in which they are here applied to Christ's flesh and Spirit.

"*Flesh*" in its limited and proper sense denotes the material substance of the living body, but its signification in Scripture is much more extensive and varied: see note on vii. 5. As denoting human nature on that side of

1 Gr. de-  
termined.

4 And *declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead:*

which our senses take direct cognizance, it is most appropriate here, where the purpose is to declare that Christ was truly man.

**4. And declared, &c.]** A higher aspect of Christ's nature is now presented in a second clause set side by side with the former, and rendered emphatic by the absence of any conjunction, and by an exact repetition of the same form :

*"Which was born of the seed of David—  
Which was designated the Son of God."*

**declared.]** The Greek word (*ἐπορθέντος*) means either "defined" mentally, as in logic, (Xen. Mem. IV. vi. 4, 6) or "designated" actually: the latter sense, which is closely connected with that of "instituting," "appointing," or "ordaining," is the only sense which the word has in the New Test. (see Acts x. 42; xvii. 31).

*the Son of God.]* Bishop Pearson, 'Creed,' Art. ii., shews that Christ is so called (besides other reasons) because He is raised by God immediately out of the earth unto immortal life, because after His Resurrection He is made actually Heir of all things, but above all because He was begotten of the Father before all worlds.

The direct and proper proof of this last meaning of the title is the express teaching of Christ and His Apostles: yet even in this sense He was indirectly proved by the Resurrection to be the Son of God.

For the resurrection was (1st) a signal manifestation of Divine power (whether exercised by Christ Himself, or by the Father in his behalf); and therefore (2ndly) a testimony to the truth of Him Who claimed to be "the Son of God;" and also (3rdly) according to St. Paul's preaching, in Acts xiii. 33, it was the prophetic sign which God had set upon His Son in the second Psalm. By it, therefore, He was marked out, or designated, as the Son of God. "Although His precepts, His miracles, His character, His express language, all pointed to the truth of His Godhead, the conscience of mankind was not laid under a formal obligation to acknowledge It, until at length He had been defined to be *the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead*" (Liddon, 'Bampton Lect.' p. 60).

We must add that the resurrection of Jesus not only proved and shewed what He was, but also wrought an actual change in the mode of His existence (Godet). For He who in the Incarnation became One Christ, by taking of the Manhood into God, by His resurrection entered for the first time as the

*One Christ both God and Man* into the glory of the Son of God. Thus was He (in Pearson's words) "defined or constituted and appointed the Son of God" ('Creed,' Art. ii.).

**with power.]** By the resurrection Christ was designated "with power" as Son of God, because power was the Divine attribute pre-eminently displayed therein. So St. Paul speaks, in Eph. i. 19, of "*the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power (lit. of the might of his strength), which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead.*"

*according to the spirit of holiness.]* The phrases *as to the flesh—as to the Spirit* are so strictly parallel, that the second must necessarily represent, as the first does, a constituent part of Christ's own being.

Moreover, the peculiar phrase "*Spirit of holiness*," found only in this passage, is evidently chosen to distinguish the holy spiritual nature of Christ from "*the Holy Spirit*," who is the Third Person of the Trinity. See Note at the end of the Chapter.

The two clauses thus present two sides or aspects of the One Incarnate Son of God; the "*flesh*" that side on which He is visibly one with us, "very man," "born of a woman;" "*the Spirit of holiness*," that side on which He—the same Son of Man—is proved by the resurrection to be the Son of God.

This "*Spirit of holiness*" (whether with older interpreters we take it to mean the essential Deity of Christ, or, as seems to be more exact, the Spirit at once Divine and human of the Incarnate Son) was in either case the sphere and organ of His Divine power. In it He triumphed over death: see 1 Pet. iii. 18, "*being put to death in (the) flesh, but quickened in (the) Spirit;*"—a passage which confirms the meaning we have given to "*flesh*" and "*Spirit*."

*by the resurrection from the dead.]* Read, *of the dead*. St. Paul never uses the expression "resurrection from the dead," but "*of the dead*" (plural). See Acts xvii. 32; xxiv. 15, 21.

So in Acts xxvi. 23. St. Paul speaks of Christ as the "*first from the resurrection of the dead*" (plural).

Christ's rising was a "*resurrection of the dead*" (plural), because in Him the general hope of mankind received a first fulfilment. Others had been raised by Prophets of old, and by Christ Himself, but only to die again: "*Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more.*"

<sup>Or, to the  
obedience  
of faith.</sup> 5 By whom we have received grace and apostleship, <sup>for obedience</sup> to the faith among all nations, for his name :

[*Jesus Christ our Lord.*] In the authorized version these words are wrongly placed in v. 3, after "*his Son.*" Their right position is at the end of v. 4. The Son of David and Son of God is thus finally described by three well-known titles; "*Jesus*" which identifies Him as the crucified Saviour, "*Christ*" the promised Messiah, "*our Lord*" the exalted King, to whom all power is given in heaven and in earth.

5. *By whom we have received.*] Rather, "*Through whom we received grace and Apostleship!*" From the mention of Christ as "*Our Lord,*" St. Paul takes opportunity to describe more fully than in v. 1 the authority which he had received from Him as "*head over all things to the Church*" (Eph. i. 22). Thus from the majesty of Christ's Person he tacitly implies the dignity of the Apostolic office.

The plural here is most appropriate, for by it St. Paul asserts his own authority in a form which does not exclude, though it does not expressly include, the other Apostles. Thus, in addressing a Church which no Apostle had yet visited, he happily ignores any distinction of authority by using the indefinite plural: on the other hand in Gal. ii. 8, 9 observe how carefully he asserts his own individual claim, even to the exclusion of Barnabas.

St. Paul often speaks of his call to apostleship as "*the grace that was given*" to him by God (Rom. xv. 15, 16; Gal. ii. 9; Eph. iii. 7-9). But we must not on that account take the two terms together as equivalent to the "*grace of apostleship,*" nor yet entirely separate them as if St. Paul had first received the personal grace of salvation, which is common to all believers, and then afterwards been called to the Apostolic office: the two moments were in him united, and the "*grace*" of which all partake was enhanced in his case by the special gift of "*apostleship.*" From being "*a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious*" (1 Tim. i. 13), he was called at once to "*preach the faith which once be destroyed*" (Gal. i. 23). Thus the sense of his unworthiness mingling with every thought of his Apostolic office makes it to himself the great memorial of God's exceeding mercy: "*Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ*" (Eph. iii. 8).

*for obedience to the faith.*] Render, *for obedience to faith:* not, as in Acts vi. 7, "*to*

6 Among whom are ye also the called of Jesus Christ :

7 To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints :

*the faith,*" i.e. to the gospel or doctrine of the faith, for the Greek Article is here omitted.

"*obedience to faith*" is man's surrender of himself in mind and heart to faith as the principle and power, "*the organic law,*" of the new life in Christ.

Margin, "*to the obedience of faith.*" But the meaning "*obedience to faith*" is confirmed by the similar phrases *obedient to the faith* (Acts vi. 7), "*obey the Gospel*" (Rom. x. 16; 2 Thess. i. 8), and the construction of the genitive is not unusual: compare "*in obeying the truth,*" lit. "*in the obedience of the truth*" (1 Pet. i. 22), and "*the obedience of (i.e. to) Christ*" (2 Cor. x. 5).

[*among all nations.*] St. Paul's original commission, of which he is here speaking, embraced both Jews and Gentiles (Acts ix. 15; xxvi. 17, 20): and though special prominence is given both in this Epistle (i. 13; xi. 13; xv. 16) and elsewhere (Acts xxii. 15 and 21; Gal. i. 16) to his mission to the Gentiles, yet here in the salutation it is more natural that his Apostolic office should be set forth in its fullest extent, and its dignity enhanced by the world-wide purpose for which it was bestowed. The actual association of Jews and Gentiles in the Church of Rome, and the desire to unite them in closer bonds of Christian fellowship, required that both should be included in the address. These considerations are confirmed by the usage of the words in the N. T. For though *εθνη* and *τὰ εθνη* commonly mean Gentiles as distinguished from Jews, the expression *πάντα τὰ εθνη* retains the fuller sense in which it is first employed, in the blessing of Abraham, Gen. xviii. 18, xxii. 18.

*for his name.*] Or, "*for his name's sake.*" The end and purpose of "*obedience to faith among all nations*" is to promote the glory of Christ, that "*in his name every knee should bow,*" and "*every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father*" (Phil. ii. 10: compare Acts v. 41; ix. 15, 16; xxi. 13).

6. *Among whom are ye also.*] Having described his commission in v. 5 as embracing all nations, the Apostle now expressly tells his readers at Rome that they are included in it, implying thereby that he has authority to address them.

*the called of Jesus Christ.*] More literally "*Jesus Christ's called ones:*" compare the expression "*God's elect*" (viii. 33), and "*Israel, my called*" (Isai. xlvi. 12). Christ's "*called*"

Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

8 First, I thank my God through

are those who belong to Him as having been called by God the Father, to whom the act of calling is always ascribed.

By adding this description of those whom he addresses, St. Paul, while asserting his own authority, at the same time recognizes their position as being already members of Christ's Church. See Introduction, § 7, pp. 12, 13.

7. Through the crowd of thoughts which had pressed in upon his mind with the first mention of the Gospel, v. 1, St. Paul has now come back to the direct relation between himself and his readers, and so proceeds to address his letter to them, and concludes the address with his usual salutation.

*To all that be in Rome, beloved of God.]* Rather, "**T**o all God's beloved that are in Rome." The direct connection is with v. 1: "*Paul . . . to all God's beloved.*" God's people are called in the O. T. "*his beloved*" (Ps. ix. 5; cxviii. 6; cxxvii. 2): St. Paul applies the term to Israel in ch. xi. 28, and to Christians in general, 1 Tim. vi. 2. One bond between the Apostle and his readers is that they are in common the objects of God's love, a second their common consecration to His service as **called saints** (Godeot).

On the omission of the words "*in Rome*," in G. g, see Introduction, § 8.

*called to be saints.]* Lit. "**calle**d saints." Compare v. 1: "**a calle**d Apostle," "God's beloved" are also His "**calle**d saints," separated by the Divine call from the world, and made a holy or consecrated people; like Israel of old (Ex. xix. 5, 6), they are not simply "**calle**d to be **hol**y" (A. V.), nor "**calle**d because **hol**y," but "**hol**y because **calle**d" (Augustine). The holiness is not primarily that of individual moral character, but that of consecration to God's service, and is therefore ascribed to all Christians, who are, however, bound by this **very** consecration to personal holiness of life. See note on viii. 30.

*Grace to you and peace.]* The form of address most usual in a Greek letter is seen in Acts xv. 23; xxiii. 26; James i. 1. But the "joy," or "health," or "prosperity" was sometimes omitted, and nothing written but the names and descriptions of the writer and reader. St. Paul having adopted this shortened form of address, now adds to it an independent sentence containing an essentially Christian salutation, in which "**grace**" is the Divine love manifesting itself towards sinful man in free forgiveness and unmerited blessing, and "**peace**," the gift of God's **grace**, is the actual state of reconciliation:

Jesus Christ for you all, that your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world.

see note on v. 1. "For when through grace sins have been forgiven and enmity done away, it remains for us to be joined in peace to Him from whom our sins alone did separate us" (Augustine). The fuller form found in the Pastoral Epistles, "*Grace, mercy, and peace,*" confirms the interpretation which thus gives to "*grace*" (*χάρις*) and "*peace*" a fulness of meaning not found in the Greek *χαίρειν* or the Hebrew *בָּרוּךְ*.

*from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.]* The original source of "*grace and peace*" is "*God our Father*," who has made us His children by adoption (viii. 15); the nearer source from which they flow to us is "*the Lord Jesus Christ*" as Head of the Church. It is clear from the salutations in the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, where the sentence is completed, "*grace . . . be multiplied*," that St. Paul's salutation also must be understood as a benediction or prayer. Thus in the apostolic letters the forms of common life are hallowed by Christian love, and a passing courtesy is transformed into a prayer for heavenly blessings.

#### 8-15. INTRODUCTION.

The salutation (1-7), which declares St. Paul's official relation to the Christians at Rome, is followed by a brief introductory statement of his personal feelings towards them, in which he declares his thankfulness for their faith (v. 8), his remembrance of them in prayer (v. 9), and his desire to visit them and to labour among them in preaching the Gospel (10-15).

*8. First I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you all.]* The thanksgiving, with which the Apostle begins this and most of his epistles, is not to be ascribed to mere rhetorical art or courteous tact in winning the good will of his readers, nor to any fond lingering over an ideal picture of a perfect Church. That for which St. Paul gives thanks to God is no imaginary excellence, but the *fact* that everywhere, in the Churches which he visits, he hears tidings of the faith of those who have embraced the Gospel in Rome. The instinct of love leads him to touch first on that which is **thankworthy in his brethren**: "It was meet to make a prelude with thanksgiving" (Ecumenius), because they not only believed, but so openly declared their belief, that it was published throughout the whole world. Observe that the Apostle does not praise them for their faith; it is too divine and excellent a gift for praise. "The greatest

<sup>Or, in  
my spirit.</sup> 9 For God is my witness, whom I serve <sup>with</sup> my spirit in the gospel of his Son, that without ceasing I make mention of you always in my prayers;

blessings call not for praise, but for something greater and better" (Aristot., 'Nic. Eth.', I. xii. 4); and St. Paul gives solemn thanks to God for his brethren's faith.

*for you all.]* See note on the reading at end of chapter. He regards their faith as a gift to himself, for which he is bound to give thanks to God: see 2 Thess. i. 3; ii. 13.

It is this feeling of personal interest in their welfare that prompts the loving, trustful word, "*my God*," that is, "the God who has given me a fresh proof of His love in your faith." Compare Phil. iv. 19.

*through Jesus Christ.]* "To render thanks to God is to offer a sacrifice of praise: and therefore he adds '*through Jesus Christ*', as through the great High Priest." (Origen.)

Meyer argues that Christ is the Mediator of thanksgiving only as the causal agent of the blessings for which thanks are given, and not as the Mediating Offerer. But that the thanksgiving itself is offered through Christ is certainly the view presented in 1 Pet. ii. 5: "*to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ*." Equally clear is the meaning of Heb. xiii. 15, Col. iii. 17, and Ephes. v. 20. We must therefore retain the earlier and more usual interpretation that St. Paul gives thanks *through Jesus Christ*, not only because the particular blessing flows from Him, and not only because by Him alone we are brought into such a relation to God that we can offer Him thanksgiving, but because our thanksgiving itself and "All our services need to be cleansed and hallowed by passing through the hands of our most holy and undefiled High Priest, to become sweet and savoury (or to receive that ὑπὲρ εὐωδίας which St. Paul speaks of), from being offered up in His Censer." (Barrow, 'Sermon on Col.' iii. 17).

**9. For God is my witness.]** St. Paul confirms the sincerity of his thanksgiving for the Christians at Rome by declaring his constant remembrance of them in prayer (v. 9), and his longing desire to see them (v. 10). This declaration he introduces by a very solemn appeal to God as witness of its truth (2 Cor. xi. 31; Phil. i. 8). Is such language too strong for the occasion? Is St. Paul, as some have thought, so carried away by the intensity of his feelings, or the fervid style of his age and country, or any other cause, as to invoke the name of God thus solemnly without an urgent reason? Or does he speak the

10 Making request, if by any means now at length I might have a prosperous journey by the will of God to come unto you.

11 For I long to see you, that I

words of truth and soberness? We must remember that the Apostle is writing from Corinth, where his sincerity was recently called in question, because his visit to that church had been postponed: to that charge he gave a full and deliberate refutation (2 Cor. i. 15-24), in the course of which (v. 23) he used even a stronger protestation than in the passage before us. Moreover, he is writing on the eve of undertaking a journey from Corinth—a city comparatively near Rome—to Jerusalem, which was far distant. He thus appears to be turning his back upon the Romans, just when it seems most natural to pay his long intended visit; and he has therefore reason to fear lest he should be suspected of fickleness or insincerity, or even of being ashamed to preach the Gospel in the great centre of learning and civilization.

At present he cannot prove his sincerity, he can only assert it; he cannot show what is in his heart, he can only call the heart-searching God to witness.

*whom I serve with my spirit.]* He whose servant and minister I am, to whom I offer no mere outward service in preaching the Gospel of His Son, but therein serve and worship Him in my spirit (xv. 16).—He is my witness that I long and pray to do His work among you (2 Tim. i. 3). He knoweth "that or (rather how) without ceasing I make mention of you always in my prayers" (Eph. i. 16; Phil. i. 3, 4).

**10. Making request, &c.]** *Making request if by any means I shall ever at length be prospered in the will of God to come unto you.* How beautifully the Apostle's language reflects the inward conflict of his feelings! The remembrance of past hindrances is combined with the foresight of future difficulties, and the eagerness of desire is tempered by resignation to the will of God, who will bring all to a prosperous issue in His own way, and at His own time.

The combination ἥδη ποτέ with a Future assigns to a long-expected event an early (*ἥδη*) but uncertain date (*ποτέ*). Compare Viger 'de Idiotismis Gr.' p. 413; Phil. iv. 10; Aristoph. 'Ranae' 931.

**be prospered.]** See 1 Cor. xvi. 2; 3 John 2; and compare the use of the same word in LXX 2 Chron. xiii. 12; Ps. i. 3; Prov. xvii. 8 (Meyer).

**11. For I long to see you.]** The reason of

may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be established;

12 That is, that I may be comforted together <sup>1</sup>with you by the mutual faith both of you and me.

<sup>1</sup>Or, in  
you.  
his earnest prayer is the desire to see, face to face, his brethren at Rome, in whose welfare he is already deeply interested. Compare xv. 23, and notes there.

The word “I long” (*ἐπιποθῶ*) expresses both the desire that draws him to them, and his regret that he has not been able to come sooner (Godet).

*some spiritual gift.*] The word “charisma” is never used in the N.T. of a gift from man, but may be applied to anything which comes from God’s free grace, whether it be a providential deliverance from death (2 Cor. i. 11), a moral virtue, as continence (1 Cor. vii. 7), God’s favour to Israel (Rom. xi. 29), the gift of eternal life in Christ Jesus (v. 15, 16; vi. 23), or any of the manifold gifts of the Spirit (xii. 6; 1 Cor. xiii. 4), whether miraculous (1 Cor. xiii. 9, 10), ministerial (1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6), or simply personal, as faith (1 Cor. xii. 9). A gift of this last kind is here meant. St. Paul hopes that in Rome, as elsewhere, his personal ministry may be attended with some gift of God’s Holy Spirit, that may confirm and strengthen his brethren in the principles and practice of the Christian life. Increase of knowledge, love, or hope, or of all these combined, would be such a Spiritual gift; but the next verse shews that the strengthening of faith is foremost in the Apostle’s thoughts. Such a gift is called *spiritual*, not as pertaining to man’s spirit, but as proceeding from the Spirit of God. St. Paul can impart it only because he has received “grace and apostleship,” for this very purpose. Compare xv. 29.

*12. That is, that I may be comforted together with you.*] A beautiful example of St. Paul’s humility! He never forgets that those whom he addresses are Christians as well as himself. At the very outset he gives thanks to God for their well-known faith; and here he does not say “that I may establish you,” but “that ye may be established,” namely by God. But, lest even thus he should seem to represent the benefit of his visit as all on their side, he hastens to correct his expression, and to place himself beside them, as sharing in the benefit of mutual comfort. He drops the idea of their needing to be established as persons weak in faith, and joins himself with them as needing to be encouraged by their faith, no

13 Now I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that oftentimes I purposed to come unto you, (but was let hitherto,) that I might have some fruit <sup>1</sup>among you also, even as among <sup>1</sup>Or, in other Gentiles.

less than they by his; for by “mutual faith,” is here meant “the faith which each sees in the other.” The whole verse may be thus rendered:—*That is, that we may be together comforted among you each by the other’s faith, yours as well as mine.* For the construction, see note at end of chapter.

13. *Now I would not have you ignorant, brethren.*] St. Paul’s usual mode of announcing some new and important point (see note on xi. 25). His first thought has been of the present and future welfare of his readers (vv. 8–12): he is thankful for their faith, and longs to help in establishing it. But then comes the question, Why has he never yet visited them? and if this be not answered, it may throw doubt upon the sincerity of his present profession. He therefore assures them that he not only now longs to see them, but has often actually formed the purpose of coming to them.

(*but was let hitherto.*)] “*And I was hindered until now.*” Again he shows his love in another way. For neither when I was hindered, says he, did I cease from the attempt, but was always attempting and always hindered and never desisting” (Chrysostom).

The nature of the hindrances is explained afterwards, xv. 22: here the Apostle only alludes to them in a brief parenthesis, lest he should seem to have changed his purpose lightly, and so hastens on to the motive of his off-intended visit.

*that I might have some fruit.*] The same modesty, which is so conspicuous in vv. 11–12, may be traced again in the words “*some*” and “*fruit*.” The emphasis is on “*some*” (*τινα*) which here, though not usually, stands first. The good which St. Paul hoped to do among them, whether much or little, he represents as a benefit to himself. In any increase of their faith and holiness and good works, he would reap a harvest to reward his labour (compare vi. 22; Phil. iv. 17, and Joh. iv. 35–38). See note at end of chapter.

*among you also, even as among other Gentiles.*] Read, *the rest of the Gentiles.* The “you” can only mean here, as throughout the context, the Christians at Rome;

14 I am debtor both to the Greeks, and to the Barbarians; both to the wise, and to the unwise.

15 So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also.

for the letter is addressed to them, and not to all the people of Rome. It is thus clear from the expression “*you also*”—“*the rest of the Gentiles*,” that the Christians at Rome were, in the mass, Gentiles. They thus belonged to “*the Apostle of the Gentiles*,” though as yet unvisited by him, Col. ii. 1.

14. *I am debtor both to the Greeks, and to the Barbarians; both to the wise, and to the unwise.*] Both to Greeks and Barbarians, both to wise and unwise I am debtor.

Nations may differ in language and civilization as “*Greeks and Barbarians*,” and men may differ in intelligence as “*wise and unwise*:” but all alike are included in the sphere of Apostolic duty, because the relation in which men stand to Christ and His Gospel is deeper and more essential than all national and personal distinctions. The Son of Man “rises above the parentage, the blood, the narrow horizon which bounded as it seemed His Human Life; He is the Archetypal Man in Whose presence distinctions of race, intervals of ages, types of civilization, degrees of mental culture, are as nothing” (Liddon, ‘Bampton Lectures,’ p. 12).

It is asked, in which class does St. Paul mean to place the Romans. And Lange answers that the Romans are included with the Greeks as having the same culture, and that Jews and Greeks are comprehended in the term “*wise*. ” Such questions should neither be asked nor answered: they show a complete misconception of the Apostle’s meaning, by trying to establish the very distinctions which he seeks to exclude. On the nationality of the Christians at Rome, see Introduction, § 3.

*I am debtor.*] St. Paul sees in his commission to preach the Gospel to all nations a debt that must be paid, or as he calls it in 1 Cor. ix. 16–19, a necessity laid on him, and a stewardship entrusted to him.

15. *So, as much as in me is, I am ready.*] Thus I for my part am ready. In accordance with this duty, which I owe to all nations, I am ready so far as it depends on me to preach the Gospel to you also that are in Rome. I have been hindered, and, if such is God’s will, may be hindered again; but there is no lack of willingness or zeal on my part. The grammatical construction

16 For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.

17 For therein is the righteous-

and exact rendering of the verse are discussed in the note at end of chapter.

*you . . . also.*] See on v. 13. Here the description “*you that are in Rome*,” shows that St. Paul is thinking of the Christian Church as set in the midst of that great city in which “*the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them*” were now concentrated, and which was also “*The common sink of all the worst vices of humanity, and therefore the noblest sphere for Evangelic zeal*” (Lightfoot, Phil. p. 13).

On the omission of ἐν Ρώμῃ in G. g, here and in v. 7, see Introduction § 8.

#### VV. 16, 17. THEME OF THE EPISTLE.

16. *For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ.*] “*Of Christ*” must be omitted, with the best MSS. Though St. Paul is directly addressing the Christians at Rome, it is not possible that he, the Apostle of the Gentiles, could think of preaching the Gospel there to that little band of believers only. The mention of Rome suggests the thought of coming face to face with the mighty power concentrated in that stronghold of Heathendom, and with the vast multitudes there gathered together out of every nation under heaven. It is this thought that speaks in the words, “*I am not ashamed of the Gospel*,” which form the transition from the introduction to the theme of the Epistle.

The treatment which St. Paul had experienced in other great cities, such as Athens, Ephesus and Corinth (whence he was now writing), might well have daunted any less steadfast soul; even he feels the full contrast between the power and pomp and splendour of “*the capital and theatre of the world*” and the seeming weakness and folly of the Cross: and yet he is not ashamed to preach even in Rome the doctrine of a crucified Saviour.

*for it is the power of God unto salvation.*] Compare 1 Cor. i. 24. The Gospel, in all its seeming weakness, is in fact “*the power of God*;” not simply a statement of God’s power, nor a mere instrument which God’s power uses, but God’s living revelation of Himself, a Divine power flowing forth from Him to save men’s souls (James i. 21).

Some have seen in this sentence a theoretical definition of the Gospel: but St. Paul is stating a fact of his own experience. He has felt this “*power of God*” in himself, he has

<sup>Hab. 2.</sup> ness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, "The just shall live by faith."

witnessed its effect on others, and has seen it shed life and joy around him, as often as it touched believing hearts.

*to every one that believeth.]* The saving efficacy of God's power is limited by faith as a condition which God himself imposes, not arbitrarily, but in accordance with the essential dignity of man's moral nature. Physical force acting upon matter has an invariable and necessary effect: moral or spiritual power varies in its effect with the free response of the spirit on which it acts. Thus the offer of salvation is the same to all: it is effectual in those who willingly accept it, and that willing acceptance is faith.

*to the Jew first.]* The Gospel as the power of God unto salvation is needful to Jew as well as Gentile: this is the point proved in ii. 1—iii. 20. Nor is there any distinction between them as to the one condition, faith, (x. 11, 12). But the word of God must be spoken "to the Jew first" (Acts xiii. 46), as having priority in "the covenants of promise," "and also to the Greek," i.e. to any one who is not a Jew. St. Paul always puts the Jew first in privilege, and first in responsibility (ii. 9, 10); so St. Peter on the day of Pentecost,—"the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off" (Acts ii. 39).

17. The description of the Gospel given in v. 16 is further explained and confirmed in each of its essential parts. The Gospel is a "power unto salvation," for a "righteousness" which is in effect life and salvation is revealed in it.

It is "God's power," for the righteousness revealed in it is "of God."

It is for "every one that believeth," for righteousness is revealed "from faith to faith."

All this is confirmed as being in accordance with the declaration of God's counsel in Habakkuk ii. 4, which promises life, i.e. salvation, to the righteous by faith.

St. Paul has thus passed by an easy and natural transition from the personal matters which form his introduction to a statement of the great doctrine which is the theme of the first eight chapters of the Epistle.

*therein is the righteousness of God revealed.]* Compare Ps. xviii. 2, "The Lord hath made known his salvation: his righteousness hath been shewed" (Marg. 'revealed,' Sept. ἀπέκαλυψεν τὴν δικαιούντην αὐτὸν, Vulg. 'revelavit') in the sight of the heathen." St. Paul's reference to this passage is made evident by his adoption in vv. 16, 17 of the

18 For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men,

Psalmist's three chief words, "salvation," "righteousness," "revealed," and of the parallelism between "salvation" (v. 16) and "righteousness" (v. 17).

*the righteousness of God.]* Rather "a righteousness of God." This term occurring in a summary statement of the great theme of the Epistle is more likely to be used in a comprehensive than in a restricted sense. We must therefore be content, at present, to define its meaning only so far as it is determined by the form of the expression, by the immediate context, and by St. Paul's previous usage. We thus find that it is a righteousness having God as its author, and man as its recipient, who by it becomes righteous: its effect is salvation, and its condition faith: it is embodied first in the person of Christ "who is made unto us wisdom from God, and righteousness" (1 Cor. i. 30), and it is bestowed on us because of Christ's redeeming work, wherein He "was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him" (2 Cor. v. 21). See more in notes on iii. 21–25.

*revealed from faith to faith.]* This is the only connection permitted by the order of the words, and it teaches us that, so far as man is concerned, the revelation of the righteousness of God begins from and leads on to faith. Compare 2 Cor. iii. 18, *from glory to glory*. To the man who listens to the Gospel without faith, the righteousness of God is not therein revealed, but remains hidden: to him who listens with faith, the righteousness of God begins to be therein revealed, and its progressive revelation tends to produce a higher degree of faith as its result. Thus "to every one that believeth" the Gospel becomes by this revelation of the righteousness of God a "power of God unto salvation," because by faith man embraces as his own the righteousness revealed to him.

*The just shall live by faith.]* This connection "shall live by faith" is required in the Hebrew of Hab. ii. 4, and corresponds best with St. Paul's application of the passage: for he does not say that "righteousness by faith is revealed," but that "righteousness is revealed from faith to faith," and as the righteousness revealed and appropriated by faith is the power of God unto salvation, "the righteous shall live—i.e., shall find life—by faith." Compare Gal. ii. 20, "the life which I now live in the flesh I live by (rather in) the faith of the Son of God," &c. See notes on Hab. ii. 4, and note at end of chapter.

who hold the truth in unrighteousness;

19 Because that which may be

known of God is manifest <sup>in them;</sup> <sub>for God hath shewed it unto them.</sub>

20 For the invisible things of him

*faith.*] The Hebrew word so rendered means properly “steadfastness,” “faithfulness,” “fidelity,” “trustiness,” rather than the active “trustfulness”; *i.e.*, it means the faith which may be relied on, rather than the faith which relies. “But it will at times approach near to the active sense: for constancy under temptation or danger with an Israelite could only spring from reliance on Jehovah. And something of this transitional or double sense it has in Hab. ii. 4.” (Lightfoot, Gal. iii. 11.)

CHAP. I. 18—III. 20. THE UNRIGHTEOUSNESS OF MAN.

St. Paul here enters upon the proof of his great theme, that both for Jew and Gentile salvation is only to be found in the revelation of the righteousness of God by faith.

First he shows, as a matter of fact and experience, that neither Gentile (i. 18—32) nor Jew (ch. ii.) has any righteousness of his own by which he can be justified before God; then, after answering objections relating to the case of the Jew (iii. 1—8), he confirms the testimony of experience by the declarations of God’s word (iii. 9—20).

18—32. St. Paul here gives us, not a history, but a Christian philosophy of history: he is not narrating the growth of idolatry and vice in this or that nation, but showing in a broad generalized view the condition of the heathen world and the causes of its corruption.

The allusions to specific forms of vice and idolatry show plainly that he is describing the heathen; but the principles which he lays down, being of universal application, involve the Jew also in like condemnation, as is seen in ch. ii.

*the wrath of God is revealed from heaven.]* “An exordium terrible as lightning” (Melandchthon) is formed by the sudden and striking contrast to the preceding verses. There is a twofold revelation: in the one is seen a “power of God unto salvation,” in the other, the destroying power of God’s wrath: there the righteousness of God, here the unrighteousness of man.

Righteousness is revealed in the Gospel; wrath is revealed “from heaven,” because there “the Lord hath prepared his throne” (Ps. ix. 7; xi. 4), and thence “His judgments go forth as the lightning” (Hosea vi. 5, and note there). The power unto salvation is for “every one that believeth”; the wrath is against them “that hold down the truth in

unrighteousness” (ch. vii. 6; 2 Thess. ii. 6). The meaning of this verse is more fully explained in the passage which follows. We there see that “*the truth*” means the knowledge of God (*vv. 19 and 25*), and that the wilful suppression of this truth struggling in the heart is what aggravates the ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, leaving them without excuse. We see also how the wrath of God is revealed, namely, in the debasing vices and conscious misery to which the sinner is given over (24—32).

*ungodliness and unrighteousness.]* *I.e.* impiety and immorality, are both regarded as sins against God. “*Ungodliness*” is the stronger expression, but “*unrighteousness*” the more comprehensive and general (Aristotle, *περὶ ἀρετῶν*, vii. 1; *Polit.*, III. c. 13, 3): this latter alone is repeated in the following clause, whence the ideal order of development is seen to be (1) unrighteousness, (2) suppression of the truth concerning God, (3) ungodliness and increased unrighteousness.

19. *Because, &c.]* The cause of God’s wrath implied in the close of v. 18 is here distinctly stated, that men have a knowledge of God which they wilfully suppress, and so leave themselves without excuse.

*that which may be known of God.]* The word *τὸ γνωτόν* occurs nowhere else in St. Paul’s epistles; but in Acts xiii. 38 and xxviii. 28, where St. Paul is the speaker, it is used, as in the N. T. generally, in a less precise sense—“known,” “notable,” or “notorious.” Here, however, the whole context rises into the region of Christian philosophy, and our translators have done well in rendering the word more strictly. See Fritzsche, and Grimm, ‘Clavis N. T. Philolog.’

*That which may be known* must not, however, be pressed to mean all that can possibly be known; but, as the next verse plainly shews, it means that knowledge of God which is or which may be gained by man’s natural faculties exercised upon God’s manifestation of Himself in creation.

*is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them.]* Rather, “*for God manifested it to them.*”

“*In them*” does not mean “among them,” as though this knowledge were limited to a few of the wise and learned, nor “in their consciousness” (Meyer), but “*in them*” as being what they are, in their very nature and constitution as men. If men had not a faculty to receive “*that which may be known of God,*”

from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal

power and Godhead; so that they <sup>Or, that  
they may be.</sup> are without excuse:

21 Because that, when they knew

He could not be said to have manifested it "to them." The verse, therefore, teaches that there is both an external manifestation of God to men, and a faculty in them to receive it; and these are the two ideas that are developed in the next verse.

Calvin's note is striking: "In saying that God manifested it, he means that the purpose for which man is created is to be the spectator of the fabric of the world; the purpose for which eyes have been given him is that by gazing on so fair an image he may be led on to its Author."

20. Explanation of the statement, "God manifested it to them."

*the invisible things of him.*] St. Paul puts in the foremost place the invisible nature of God's attributes, just because men sinned by substituting visible images for His invisible perfections. The plural represents the invisible nature of God in its manifold properties, as explained by what follows.

*from the creation of the world.*] Most modern interpreters understand this merely as a mark of time, "since the creation." See note at end of chapter. But the older interpretation has more force, and is not really liable to the charge of tautology. "The creation of the world," viewed as a whole, is first presented as the *source* from which man derives a knowledge of the unseen God; and then the *method* is further described; the manifold invisible attributes become clearly seen, being conceived in the mind by means of the various works.

The invisible lying behind the visible as its *cause*, the unchangeable upholding all the changes of the world, the wisdom whose thoughts are written in heaven, and earth, and sea, the power which makes those thoughts realities,—these and the other Divine attributes are conceived in the mind (*νοοίπερα*), and so discerned by means of the things that are made. The spontaneous act of reason by which the mind grasps in creation the idea of a Divine Author, St. Paul assumes and asserts as an admitted and unquestionable fact; this fact is indeed the true intellectual basis, as conscience is the moral basis, of all natural religion. On the process by which the mind ascends from the sensible impressions of things that are seen to the idea of the invisible God, "and so as it were resounds and echoes back the Great Creator's name," see Cudworth, 'Immutable Morality,' p. 177; and a fine passage quoted from Leibnitz, 'Essais de Théodicée,' Part I., by Saisset,

'Essai de Philosophie religieuse,' Part I. § 5.

*bis eternal power.*] Among "the invisible things" of God "power" alone is specified, because it is the attribute first and most prominently displayed in Creation. It is clearly seen to be *eternal*, because by it all things temporal were created. The other attributes of God which are clearly seen in His works, such as wisdom and goodness, St. Paul sums up in one word, not *Godhead*, but *Divinity*: the word is not that which expresses the being or essence of God, i.e. Deity (Col. ii. 9), but a kindred and derived word, signifying the Divine quality or perfection of God as seen in His attributes.

*so that they are without excuse.] That they might be without excuse.* The words (*εἰς τὸ εἴλιον*) express not a mere result, but a purpose. See i. 11; iv. 11, 16, 18; vi. 12; vii. 4, 5; viii. 29; xi. 11, &c. On 2 Cor. viii. 6 see note there.

Most modern Commentators have missed the true connection of this clause, and of the whole passage (v. 19-21).

The sentence, "For the invisible things of him . . . are clearly seen . . . , is an explanation of the statement God manifested it unto them; and as the mode in which this manifestation was made to them is the mode in which it is made to all men, at all times, the explanation is put in the most general and abstract form (Present Tense and Passive Voice), without any limitation of times or persons; while the preceding and following statements (marked by the historic Aorists) refer definitely to those whom St. Paul is describing (*αὐτούς*, v. 19, *αὐτοῖς*, v. 20, *αὐτῶν*, v. 21), the men that hold down the truth in unrighteousness.

Thus the sense flows on without interruption, and the whole passage may be rendered as follows:—*For God manifested it unto them; for the invisible things of him, his eternal power and divinity, from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made; That they might be without excuse, because that when they knew God they glorified him not as God.*

Chrysostom's objection, often repeated by others, that it could not be God's *purpose* in manifesting Himself to deprive men of excuse, although this was the *result*, is discussed in the note at the end of the chapter. Here it may be enough to say, God's *purpose* was

God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.

to leave nothing undone on His part, the omission of which might give men an excuse for sin.

21. "That knowledge, or rudiment (*scintilla*) of knowledge, concerning God which may be obtained by contemplation of His creatures . . . sufficeth to convince atheism, but not to inform religion. . . . No light of nature extendeth to declare the will and true worship of God." (Bacon, 'Advt. of Learning,' B. II.) This is true of God's particular will, and of special modes of worship desired by Him; but St. Paul here clearly teaches that men knew enough of God from His works to glorify Him in a way befitting His Divine Nature; but their fault lay in not loving what they knew:—"Minus amant quod summe est." "They love not perfectly the perfect Being," (Aug.) "The glory of God is the admirable excellency of that virtue divine which being made manifest causeth men and angels to extol His greatness, and in regard thereof to fear Him. By being glorified, it is not meant that He doth receive any augmentation of glory at our hands, but His name we glorify, when we testify our acknowledgment of His glory." (Hooker, 'E. P.,' Bk. II. ii. 1.)

St. Paul touches the root of sin in the words "*when they knew God, they did not glorify him as God, or give thanks.*" This passage seems to have inspired that loftiest strain of Christian adoration: "We glorify Thee, we give thanks to Thee for Thy great glory." The context however leads us to think of God not only in His nature, but in His works, as Creator and Ruler of the world and the source of all natural blessings to mankind. The passage will thus mean: "They did not glorify him as God (in his Divine perfections) or give thanks (to him as God the author and giver of all good)." Compare St. Paul's discourses to heathen audiences in Acts xiv. 17, xvii. 24–29.

*but became vain.]* The direct opposition in act to glorifying God as God, is to exchange His glory for an image, v. 23: but St. Paul first shows the inner root of this opposition. The Hebrew word נַפְרָה "breath," "vapour," "vanity," is specially applied to an idol, as in Jer. ii. 5: "*they are gone far from me, and have walked after vanity* (LXX τῶν ματαίων, vain things, i.e. idols) *and are become vain*" (ἐμπατεῖσθησαν). See notes on 2 Kings xvii. 15, and compare

22 Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools,

23 And changed the glory of the uncorruptible <sup>b</sup>God into an image <sup>a Ps. 106. 20.</sup>

1 Sam. xxvi. 21: "*I have played the fool* (μεμάταιωμαι) *and have erred exceedingly.*"

*in their imaginations.]* The word διαλογισμός is commonly used of evil thoughts both in the LXX and New Test. It is variously rendered: "imagination" (Lam. iii. 60); "reasoning" (Luke ix. 46); and most frequently "thoughts" (Matt. xv. 19; 1 Cor. iii. 20). Here it means the false notions which men formed for themselves of God in opposition to the truth set before them in His works. "Wherein exactly did this *vanity* (of their thoughts) consist? In two things: (1) in the absence of a foundation in truth; and (2) in the positive absurdity of the idle fancies embodied in the Heathen Mythology and worship." (Bishop Thirlwall.)

*and their foolish heart was darkened.]* The heart is in Scriptural language the seat of intellectual and moral as well as of animal life, and out of it proceed evil thoughts (Matt. xv. 19, &c.). Thus their heart was already proved to be "foolish" or "void of understanding" when they failed to discern, or discerning did not love, the truth which God had set before them. They turned from the light *and their foolish heart was darkened*: this was a worse state than the former (Ephes. iv. 18). The abuse of reason impaired the faculty itself, and by following their vain thoughts they were led into a lower depth of spiritual darkness.

22. Self-conceit and folly go hand in hand: "*while professing themselves to be wise, they became fools*" (1 Cor. i. 19–24). Most modern interpreters agree with Calvin that the Apostle does not refer to the special profession of wisdom among Greek philosophers; for they were not the authors of idolatry, nor was it peculiar to them to think themselves wise in the knowledge of God. He is describing the conceit of wisdom which is necessarily connected with a departure from Divine truth, and out of which therefore idolatry in its manifold and fantastic forms must have sprung. "For heathenism," adds Meyer, "is not the primeval religion out of which men gradually advanced to the knowledge of the true God; but it is the consequence of falling away from the primitive revelation of God in His works."

The same original belief in one God may be traced in Egyptian, Indian, and Greek mythology, and this accordance of early traditions agrees with the Indian notion that

made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things.

24 Wherefore God also gave them

"truth was originally deposited with men, but gradually slumbered and was forgotten" (Rawlinson, "Herodotus" Book II., Appendix, ch. iii. p. 297). On the primitive records of a pure Monotheism in Egypt, see note 36 on p. 450 of Vol. I. of this Commentary.

23. *And changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man.*] In their folly and as the outward expression of it men exchanged the worship of God for that of idols. The contrast between the *incorruptible* and the *corruptible* serves to aggravate the folly.

*into an image made like to corruptible man.*] Read, *for an image of the form of corruptible man.* The language, partly borrowed from Ps. cvi. 20, means not that they changed God's glory *into* an image, for this is not possible either in thought or act; but that they exchanged one object of worship *for* another. On the grammatical construction see note at end of chapter.

That St. Paul is here describing the origin of actual outward idolatry is clear from the whole context, and especially from the allusions to Ps. cvi. 20 (which describes the worship of the golden calf), and to the Egyptian worship of "birds and four-footed beasts, and creeping things," the ibis, the bull, the serpent and the crocodile. The statues of the gods of Greece by which St. Paul was surrounded at Corinth may have been in his mind as he wrote, but idols in human form were common in all heathen countries, and the Apostle is here giving a view of the origin and growth of idolatry in general, not a description of any particular form of it existing in his time. His language is partly taken from the Book of Wisdom (see xi.-xiii. and particularly xi. 15, xiii. 13) which itself echoes the thoughts of Isaiah (xliv. 13). Compare Deut. iv. 15-18 and Ps. cxv. 4-7.

#### 24-32. THE DIVINE RETRIBUTION.

This is shown first in the abandonment of the Heathen to unnatural vices (24-27), and then in their complete and utter depravity (28-32).

24. *Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts.*] Read, *Wherfore God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts to uncleanness.* What is the nature of this Divine agency?

1. *Permissive.* Chrysostom (*τιναρεύ*), Theodore (*συνεχώρησεν*), and others reduce St.

up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves:

Paul's statement to this, that God simply permitted the heathen to fall into uncleanness. But the force of the Greek words cannot be thus softened down: see 2 Chron. xxxii. 11; Matt. x. 21, xxiv. 9; 1 Cor. v. 5.

2. *Privative.* "How did God give them over?" Not by compelling, but by forsaking them" (Aug., Serm. 59). All history shows that God did not deal with other nations as He did with His chosen people, raising up prophets and sending warnings and chastisements directly and visibly from Himself to restrain or recall them from idolatry and impurity.

When the heathen turned away from Him, shutting Him out from their thoughts and hearts, and giving His honour to senseless idols, He "gave them over in (not *through* as A.V.) the lusts of their hearts to uncleanness." God did not cause their impurity, but He abandoned them to the natural consequences of the lusts already working in them. (Aug. on Ps. 35.)

3. *Judicial.* The preceding interpretation is right as far as it goes, but inadequate unless accompanied by a right view of what are called "natural consequences." We learn from experience that one sin leads to another, and that lust indulged gains greater mastery.

"This is the very curse of evil deed,  
That of new evil it becomes the seed."  
SCHILLER (*quoted by Schaff*).

What the Apostle further teaches us is that this law of our moral nature is a law of the living God, who Himself works in and by it: and this is not a thought peculiar to St. Paul or his age, but a truth frequently taught in Scripture and acknowledged by every religious mind (Ps. lxxxi. 12; Acts vii. 42).

It is none the less true that every downward step is the sinner's own wilful act, for which he knows himself to be responsible. These two truths are recognized by the mind as irreconcilable in theory, but co-existent in fact; and the true interpretation of St. Paul's doctrines must be sought, not by paring down any, but by omitting none.

*to dishonour their own bodies between themselves.*] Or, that *their bodies should be dishonoured among them.* See note at end. Compare 1 Cor. vi. 15-18. It is not necessary to go beyond the Bible for instances of the close connexion between idolatry and impurity (see Num. xxv. 2; Wisd. xiv. 12, 23-27). As the heathen dis-

25 Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen.

26 For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature:

27 And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another;

honoured God by their idols, so He gave them up to dishonour their bodies by impurity.

25. To make more distinct this correspondence between the sin that was punished and the sin that was its penalty, St. Paul again points to the cause for which God gave them up,—a cause lying in their own character as “men who exchanged the truth of God for the lie.” (See note on v. 23.) “The truth of God” is His true nature as manifested in His works, the glory of the Creator (v. 23). “The lie” is the false substitute to which the idolater gives the honour that is due to God only (Is. xliv. 20; Jer. xiii. 25, xvi. 19).

*more than the Creator.]* Marg. “rather than the Creator.” The context shows that they did not worship the Creator at all, but passing by Him worshipped the creature in preference to Him.

*who is blessed for ever. Amen.]* A natural outburst of piety in the familiar language of the Old Testament (Ps. lxxxix. 52). However the Heathen may dishonour God, His glory is not thereby really impaired: He still “inhabits the praises of his people” (Ps. xxii. 3), He is still “blessed for ever” (2 Cor. xi. 31).

26, 27. *For this cause.]* A second time the Apostle points to the apostasy of the Heathen (v. 25) as the cause why “God gave them up unto vile affections,” or “shameful passions.” The sin against God’s nature entails, as its penalty, sin against man’s own nature. “Their error” was that of apostasy in exchanging the truth of God for the lie (v. 25): “the recompence which was meet,” i.e., which according to God’s appointment they must receive, was their abandonment to these unnatural lusts. Those who know what Greek and Roman poets have written on the vices of their countrymen can best appreciate the grave and modest simplicity of the Apostle’s language.

28–31. The unnatural lusts already described were the most striking proof that the Heathen world was lying under the wrath of

ther; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompence of their error which was meet.

28 And even as they did not like <sup>Or, to acknowledge.</sup> to retain God in *their* knowledge, <sup>Or, a mind void of judgment.</sup> God gave them over to <sup>a</sup> a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient;

29 Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, co-

God. But such shameful sins, however common, were by no means universal, nor were they the only sins in which a Divine retribution was to be traced. St. Paul therefore adds a comprehensive summary of other sins to which the Heathen were given over.

25. *And even as they did not like.]* For the third time the Apostle insists on the correspondence between the impiety which rejected God, and the penal consequences of that rejection. This correspondence is heightened in the original by a play on words which can hardly be reproduced in English: “Even as they reprobated (lit. did not approve) keeping God in knowledge, God gave them up to a reprobate mind.” By “a reprobate mind” is meant a mind that is condemned and rejected as worthless (1 Cor. ix. 27; Tit. i. 16). The words “they did not approve” imply that their rejection of God was not unconscious, but deliberate and disdainful. Instead of improving their first knowledge of God (*γνώστες*, v. 21) into fuller knowledge (*ἐπιγνώσις*) by attention and reflection, they put it from them, and so became “the Heathen that knew not God” (1 Thess. iv. 5).

“Mind” here means the whole reasoning faculty, intellectual and moral, all that conspires in doing a good action, or, as here, in doing “the things which are not befitting” (xii. 2; Eph. iv. 17).

29–31. The moral condition of the Heathen whom God has given over to a reprobate mind. In this catalogue of sins there is no strict system of arrangement, but traces of a sort of natural order may be seen in the grouping of kindred ideas, and even of words which sound somewhat alike in Greek. The force of the passage is much increased by the absence of all connecting particles.

29. In the first group we must omit the word “fornication” with the best MSS. (NABCK, &c.), and read “Filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, covetousness, malice.” “Unrighteousness” comes first as the

vetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers,

30 Backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents,

31 Without understanding, cove-

nant-breakers, <sup>1</sup>without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful:

32 Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but <sup>1</sup>have pleasure in them that do them.

most general term, and one already used to describe the state against which God's wrath is revealed (*v.* 18).

By "wickedness" (*πονηρία*) is meant the active mischievousness which is connected with the inward disposition expressed by "maliciousness" (*κακία*) (Trench, *Syn. of N.T.* 2nd Ser.). The two words are connected in 1 Cor. v. 8, *the old leaven of malice and wickedness*.

*envy, murder.]* The natural sequence of these ideas is made more emphatic in Greek by the alliteration φθόνοι, φίνοι. Compare Eurip. 'Troades,' 763, and Lightfoot, Gal. v. 21. For "debate," read "strife." "Malignity" (*κακονθεία*) is a disposition to take all things in the worst sense, a characteristic of the aged and the calumnious (Arist. *Rhet.* II. xiii. 3; III. xv. 10).

30. "Backbiters" or "slanderers" is a more general term than "whisperers," including all who talk against their neighbours, whether openly or secretly.

*Haters of God.]* The word elsewhere has always a passive sense, "hated of God" (Vulg. Syr.), and is explained by Meyer in that sense as being "a summary judgment of moral indignation respecting all the preceding particulars, so that looking back on these it forms a resting-point in the disgraceful catalogue." But in the earliest notice of this passage (Clement, 'Ep. ad Cor.' c. 35), an active sense is ascribed to the word (*Οευρύγνα*, "hatred of God"); it has the same sense "haters of God" in the Pseudo-Clement, Hom. I. c. 12, and is so understood here by Theodoret, Eusebius, and Suidas. This active sense is undoubtedly better suited to a catalogue of sins, and the position of the word is most striking at the head of a descending series of the forms of arrogance, first towards God and then towards men. The ascending order is found in 2 Tim. iii. 2 "boasters, proud, blasphemers."

*despotic, proud, boasters.]* The worse forms of the sin come first.

The "despotic," or "insolent" are injurious in act (1 Tim. i. 13); the "proud" overweening in their thoughts towards others; "boasters" vain-glorious about themselves (see Trench). "Inventors of evil things" are

strikingly described in Ps. xxxvi. 4, and Prov. vi. 12-15.

In 2 Macc. xii. 31, Antiochus is called "*the author of all mischief*" (*παρηγός κακίας εἰπετής*), and Philo describes the advisers of Flaccus (c. iv.) as "sowers of sedition, busybodies, devisers of evil" (*εἴρηται κακῶν*).

*disobedient to parents.]* The want of dutiful affection in the family stands first among a series of sins indicating (by the very form of the Greek words) the want of every principle on which social morality is based (Meyer). The same sin has the same bad pre-eminence in a similar series in 2 Tim. iii. 2. "*Disobedient to parents, unkankful, unbold, without natural affection, truce-breakers.*"

31. The word here rendered "implacable," and in 2 Tim. iii. 3 "truce-breakers" has probably been brought in from that passage. Omitting it we may translate the verse thus: *Without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, without mercy;* "*Covenant breakers*" (*ἀδινθίτους*) is the same word which is thrice applied to "*treacherous Judah*" in Jer. iii. 7, 8, 10.

32. The "reprobate mind" reaches the last stage of wickedness in men that are conscious of the deadly guilt of such sins as have been described, and yet not only do them, but also take pleasure in their being done by others.

On the various readings in this verse see Note at end.

*Who knowing.] Men that well knowing,* i.e. men of such a character that though they well know, &c.

"*the judgment of God*" (*δικαίωμα*) is that just sentence which He ordains as the Law-giver and enforces as the Judge of all mankind; see ii. 16. St. Paul here speaks of it as a judgment fully known even to the reprobate, and therefore as one that has been stamped indelibly upon man's conscience.

*commit.]* Read *practise*: see on ii. 2, 3.

*worthy of death.]* See Luke xxiii. 15; Acts xxiii. 29; xxv. 11, 25; xxvi. 31, in all which passages "death" means simply capital punishment. But it is evident that the Apostle here speaks of death (1) as a punishment of sin and therefore not merely as the natural end of this life; (2) as a punishment ordained

by God, and therefore not simply the last penalty of human law; (3) as a Divine punishment recognized by the Heathen, therefore not only as revealed in the Mosaic Law or the Scriptural account of the first entrance of death.

*not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them]* not only do them, but also have pleasure in them that practise them. "Not only . . . but also:" the climax thus expressly indicated is in fact double: (1) To "practise" is more than to "do," implying more of deliberation and habit; (2) A man may "do" evil under the incentive of passion, for the sake of the attendant gratification or gain: he can approve evil in others only as evil, for its own sake.

The word rendered "*have pleasure in*"

(*συνευδοκεῖν*) does not describe a passive assent or acquiescence in evil, but active consent and approval: see Luke xi. 48; Acts viii. 1; xxii. 20; 1 Cor. vii. 12, 13.

The force of St. Paul's language is impaired in the Authorized Version by its different and faulty renderings of the word *πράσσειν*, "commit" and "do." See note on vii. 15.

It is an aggravation of guilt to "know the judgment of God that they which practise such things are worthy of death," and yet to "have pleasure in them that practise them." It is thus evident that St. Paul's climax, far from being artificial, feeble, or inappropriate (as some consider it) is clear and forcible in expression, just in thought, and most appropriate in its place at the close of the dark catalogue of sins.

#### ADDITIONAL NOTES on Chap. I., vv. 1, 4, 8, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 23, 24, 32.

**1. Christ Jesus.** This order, found in B. am. fuld. Arm. and a few Fathers, is preferred by modern critics as less usual, and therefore more likely to have been altered. It is also characteristic of St. Paul, to whom the Lord was first made known, not as the man Jesus, but as the risen and glorified Christ. The same order is found in the salutation in 1 Cor., 2 Cor., Eph., Phil., Col., 1 Tim., 2 Tim. (Tisch. 8).

**4. "The Spirit of holiness."**] This title has been interpreted as meaning (1) The Holy Ghost, the 3rd Person of the Trinity; (2) The essential Deity of the Son; (3) the Spirit of the Incarnate Son.

(1) Chrysostom and Theodoret explain that Jesus was proved to be the Son of God in accordance with the pouring out of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles after His resurrection.

Others find the proof of His Divine Sonship in the miracles which He wrought according to the power of the Holy Ghost dwelling in Him, or in the predictions of the Prophets who spake of Him as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, or in the Resurrection itself supposed to be effected by the special operation of the Holy Ghost (see note on viii. 11).

Against all these interpretations there are two decisive objections, that they disregard the peculiar title *πνεῦμα ἀγωνίστης*, and that by giving a different sense to the Preposition (*κατά*) they destroy the parallelism of the two phrases—"according to the flesh," "according to the Spirit."

(2) The "Spirit of holiness" is supposed to mean the essential Deity of the Son, that pre-existent Divine Nature to which the

Human Nature was added in the Incarnation.

(3) The "Spirit of holiness" is the Spirit of the Incarnate Son, the God Man, and therefore at once human and Divine.

Either of these two latter interpretations is consistent with the language of St. Paul, and in choosing between them, it is well to recall the wise caution of Dean Jackson, 'Creed,' Bk. vii. Chap. 30. "The manner of the union between the Son of God and the seed of Abraham is a mystery (that one of the blessed Trinity alone excepted) most to be admired by all, and least possible to be exactly expressed by any living man of all the mysteries whose belief we profess in this Apostles' Creed."

If we adopt the former of these two interpretations, we must admit that St. Paul does not here give a complete account of Christ's twofold nature. For otherwise we must either deny that Christ had any human spirit, which is the Apollinarian heresy, or say that His spirit was included in the "flesh" derived from the seed of David.

The difficulty is discussed by Origen in his comment on the passage, by Augustine, 'Enchiridion,' c. 38, and very fully by Aquinas, 'Summa Theologica,' Pars III. Qu. 32, where the statements of Ambrose and Jerome are quoted.

The Catholic doctrine can hardly be more exactly stated than by Jackson, 'Creed,' Bk. vii. ch. 30: "Neither the substance which the Son of God took from the blessed Virgin, nor the reasonable soul which was united unto it, had any proper existence before their union with the Divine nature." "Christ's reasonable soul was not in order either of time or

nature first created, then assumed, but it was created while it was assumed, and assumed while it was created."

This statement of Dean Jackson's seems fully to justify the third interpretation, namely that Christ's human spirit is included, not in the "flesh," but in the "*Spirit of holiness*," as being the Spirit of Christ.

The same distinction of "flesh" and "Spirit" in the Incarnate Son is found in 1 Tim. iii. 16, "*Who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit,*" where Bp. Elliott rightly maintains that "the Spirit" is not itself the Deity, but the "higher principle of spiritual life," in which Christ "was shewn to be the All-holy and the All-righteous, yea, manifested with power to be the Son of God."

The student who may wish to pursue the subject should observe that in the passages which describe the Incarnation (Matt. i. 18, 20; Luke i. 35), and also in the early Greek Fathers and Creeds, *πνεῦμα ἄγιον* stands without the Article. This distinction was of course lost in Latin, and this makes it the more remarkable that the Latin Fathers so generally interpret "Holy Spirit" in those passages of the Son; see Tertullian, 'c. Praxeum,' § 26, 'de Carne Christi,' § 18, 'c. Marcionem' iv. §. 18, Hilary, 'de Trinitate,' X. "Assumpta Sibi per Se ex Virgine carne, Ipse Sibi et ex Se animam Concepti per Se corporis co-aptavit." Compare the Preface to the works of S. Hilary, § 57; Bishop Bull, 'Defensio Fidei Nicænae,' pp. 52, 53, 139, 203 (Oxon. 1846); Dorner, 'Person of Christ,' I. ii. pp. 367 ff., 'Protestant Theology,' II. 457; Pfeleiderer, 'Paulinism,' I. 125.

**8.** For *ὑπέρ πάντων ὑμ.* Lachm. Tisch. Treg. read *περί* with preponderance of authority. A comparison of Ephes. i. 16 (*ὑπέρ*) with 1 Cor. i. 4; 1 Thess. i. 2; 2 Thess. i. 3; ii. 13 shows that *ὑπέρ* might have been used in the same sense as *περί*.

**12.** There is a little irregularity in the grammatical construction.

Meyer, in order to find a subject for *συμπαρακληθῆναι* makes it parallel to *ἰδεῖν*: "For I long to see you, &c.; that is, to be comforted among you."

The objections to this construction are:

1. It passes over the nearer connection with *εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς* to the more distant *ἰδεῖν*.

2. It makes St. Paul's correction of his expression apply to *ἰδεῖν κ.τ.λ.*, which does not as a whole need correction, instead of the part *εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς* which is the direct cause of the correction.

3. It supplies as a subject for *συμπαρακληθῆναι* only *ἐμέ*, which does not agree with the following phrase *τὴς ἐν ἀλλήλοις πιστεῶς ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ*.

For these reasons it is much simpler, and in fact necessary, to understand *ὑμᾶς = νῦν καὶ ἐμέ* as the subject.

If it be objected that where a new subject is introduced it ought to be distinctly expressed, it is sufficient to answer: 1st, that *ὑμᾶς* could not be here expressed in the sense required (*νῦν καὶ ἐμέ*), because the formal antithesis *εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς, τοῦτο δέ ἔστιν ὑμᾶς συμπαρακληθῆναι* would have limited *ὑμᾶς* to a sense excluding instead of including *ὑμᾶς*; and secondly, that St. Paul indicates the subject, which he could not express, by the *σὺν* in *συμπαρακληθῆναι*—a compound found nowhere else in the New Test. or LXX.

**13. καρπὸν σχῶ.**] "*Ἐχειν* in its manifold collocations with *τιμῆν, δόξαν, &c.,* signifies 'assequi,' and so here" (Tholuck).

This is a wrong explanation of the right meaning of *σχῶ*, "that I might get." The verb *ἔχω* means to have, hold, or possess: but the aorist has a momentary and, as it were, initiative force, which may often be expressed by "get": see John iv. 52; Matt. xxi. 38; Mark ii. 25; Acts xxv. 26; Phil. ii. 27; 1 Thess. i. 9.

**15. οὐτῶς τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον.** Various constructions have been proposed.

A. *τὸ κ. ἐ. πρ.* taken together as subject

(1) to a sentence *οὐτῶς ἔστιν* = "in accordance with this duty is the readiness on my part to preach."

(2) to a sentence *ἔστιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι.*

"Accordingly the desire on my part is to preach."

B. *τὸ κατ' ἐμέ* taken apart from *πρόθυμον.*

(1) as an adverbial phrase: "thus there is—so far as in me lies—a readiness," &c.

(2) as subject to *πρόθυμον ἔστιν.* "So my part is ready; so I for my part am ready."

The choice lies between A (2), which is harsh, and B (2), which is supported (though not fully) by Phil. i. 12, and is decidedly to be preferred as giving a proper grammatical construction.

**17. The just shall live by faith]** The accents in the Hebrew do not indicate the connection, "the just by his faith," but show that the stress of the sentence is on "faith," which is placed emphatically before the verb: "The just . . . by his faith shall he live." See Delitzsch on Hab. ii. 4 quoted by Pusey, who adds, "the expression *just by his faith* does not occur either in the Old or New Test. In fact, to speak of one really righteous (as *צִדְקָה* always is) as being "righteous by his faith" would imply that men could be righteous in some other way." ('Commentary on the Minor Prophets.)

The *δέ* in *οὐ δέ δίκαιος*, retained by St. Paul, shows that the antithesis is between "the

proud" and "the just," not between "the just by faith" and "the just" in any other way.

The LXX ἐκ πίστεως μον (or as in some MSS ὁ δὲ δίκαιος μον ἐκ πίστεως) ζήσεται seems to have arisen from mistaking ὁ for αὐτόν. St. Paul omits the erroneous μον without inserting αὐτόν, as unnecessary for his purpose. See on Gal. iii. 11, and on Heb. ii. 4.

20. ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου.] The phrase seems to occur nowhere else in LXX. or N. T.

When the Creation is employed as a mark of time, the phrases are:

(1) ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (Matt., Luke, Hebr., Apocal. Cf. πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, Eph. i. 4).

(2) ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς κόσμου, Matt. xxiv. 21.

(3) ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως, Mar. x. 6; xiii. 19;

2 Pet. iii. 4; Apoc. iii. 14.

The Peshito Syriac gives the same rendering here as in Matt. xxv. 34, John xvii. 24, "from the foundation of the world." And in Ps. Salom. viii. 7, ἀπὸ κτίσεως οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, is certainly a mark of time.

The Vulgate, on the other hand, for its usual renderings "a constitution mundi," or "ab initio mundi," here gives "a creatura mundi," meaning "the created universe."

Theodoret, Ecumenius, Cyril, Photius, Luther, Calvin, &c., regard creation as the source of the knowledge.

**That they might be without excuse.**] The difficulty found in this hard saying since the days of Chrysostom, being due not to St. Paul but to his interpreters, must not induce us to deny the plain grammatical sense of the Apostle's words.

1. The rule that *εἰς τὸ* with an Infinitive expresses an end or *purpose*, not a mere *consequence*, seems to have no exception in the N. T.

The strongest apparent exception (2 Cor. viii. 6), has received its true interpretation from the fine insight of Meyer, following the clue given in the words διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ: "In the fact that the increase of charity wrought by God's will in the Macedonians, had encouraged him to bid Titus extend the collection to Corinth, St. Paul sees the fulfilment of the Divine purpose which he therein serves."

2. The speculative objection that "it can hardly be thought that 'the conviction, confusion, and condemnation of men was any part of the Divine plan in Creation, although it follows as a consequence from it'" (Bp. Wordsworth) is set aside by the distinction which Hooker has so clearly established between the "principal" will of God, and His "occasional" will. (See Appen-

dix I. to 'Eccles. Polity' Bk. V. "But above all things we are to note what God willetteth simply of his own voluntary inclination, and what by occasion of something precedent, without which there would be in God no such will."

The simple or "principal" will of God in giving a knowledge of Himself to His reasonable creatures is, that they may find their happiness in Him; it is only "by occasion" of their sinful neglect or abuse of this knowledge that God willetteth "as it were with a kind of unwillingness," that they should be without excuse. In like manner Leibnitz, following the Schoolmen, distinguishes in God "two aspects of the will: one an antecedent will, which has for its object all that is good; and the other a consequent and decretory will, which acts for the best, and includes evil as a condition of good." (Saisset, 'Essai de Philos. relig.' p. 231.)

3. It is to be carefully observed that the purpose ascribed to God in making Himself known is not "the conviction, confusion, and condemnation of men"; it is not that they might be punished for sinning against knowledge, but that they might have no excuse for not knowing.

23. The construction ἀλλάττειν τι ἐν των is not found in classical Greek, but was adopted by the LXX in imitation of the Hebrew יְמַלֵּת "to exchange" followed by בְּ of the thing with which anything is exchanged: see Lev. xxvii. 10; Ps. cvi. 20; Sirac. vii. 18, Μή ἀλλάξης φίλον ἀδιαφόρου μηδέ ἀδελφὸν γῆγεν εὐ χρυσιώ Σονφείρ.

24. τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς.] This is the reading of modern critical editors (Tisch. 8), and is to be rendered that their bodies should be dishonoured among them. The rendering "so that," &c. (Alford) is scarcely admissible.

The use of τοῦ with Inf. to express merely the event unmixed with the design, is very questionable. St. Paul commonly uses it to express the *purpose*, or at least the *tendency* of an act: Rom. vi. 6, vii. 3, xi. 8, 10; 1 Cor. x. 13; Gal. iii. 10. The reading ἐν ἄντοῖς is found in the majority of later uncials, in good cursives 17, 37, 47, in the Vulgate, Origen, Chrysostom, and Theodoret. It requires the Middle sense of ἀτιμάζεσθαι, against which the absence of other instances is not decisive.

ἐν ἄντοῖς, retained by Meyer, expresses more clearly than would ἐν ἀλλήλοις the sin against their own, as well as against each other's body.

32. The Vatican MS. (Tischendorf, 1867) for ἐπίγνωστες, reads ἐπίγνωσκούτες, and for ποιούστις, συνενδοκούστις, the participles ποι-ούντες, συνενδοκούντες.

Clement of Rome (Cor. c. 35) after de-

nouncing some of the sins mentioned by St. Paul in vv. 29, 30, adds: *ταῦτα γάρ οἱ πράσσοντες στυγητοὶ τῷ Θεῷ ὑπάρχοντι, οἱ μόνον δὲ οἱ πράσσοντες ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ συνευδοκοῦντες τοῖς πράσσοντι.*

Hence it has been supposed that Clement found in Romans the reading,—*οἱ μόνον δὲ οἱ ποιοῦντες ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ συνευδοκοῦντες τοῖς πράσσοντι.*

But it is far more probable that the trans-

scriber of B, or some earlier MS., having the passage of Clement by his side, substituted the Participles in the text of Romans by mistake.

The sentence being thus incomplete, as in B, later Copyists tried to complete it by various additions: *οὐκ ἐνόησαν D E, οὐκ ἔγνωσαν G.*

For a full discussion see Reiche, ‘Comment. Critic.’

## CHAPTER II.

**I** *They that sin, though they condemn it in others, cannot excuse themselves, 6 and much less escape the judgment of God, 9 whether they be Jews or Gentiles. 14 The Gentiles cannot escape, 17 nor yet the Jews, 25 whom their circumcision shall not profit, if they keep not the law.*

### CHAP. II.—THE JEW BROUGHT INTO JUDGMENT.

**1–29.** St. Paul pursues his proof of the universal need of such a saving power as is contained in the revelation of the righteousness of God by faith.

He has traced the downward course of mankind from the first wilful rejection of the knowledge of God through all the stages of idolatry and vice, showing the mutual reactions of moral depravity and mental darkness. Under general terms, and without once naming the Gentiles, he has painted the prominent features of the heathen world in bold and vigorous strokes. As the picture draws towards an end the shadows deepen, until at last in v. 32 we see that final stage of corruption in which men, having lost all natural virtue themselves and even the hatred of vice in others, retain only the consciousness of their misery and guilt, knowing the just sentence of God on them which do such things.

But there were some among the heathen and many among the Jews to whom this description could not be applied in its strongest *external* features of blind idolatry and hideous vice. They had not lost all knowledge of the true nature of God; they did not practise, still less applaud, the grosser forms of vice; their moral sense was keen enough to condemn the sins of others: yet they too must be brought to feel themselves guilty before God. How does St. Paul effect this? He strikes at the conscience, and strikes suddenly and sharply: “thou that judgest doest the same things: therefore the moral sense which judges others, but does not restrain thyself from evil, increases thy

**T**HEREFORE thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things.

2 But we are sure that the judg-

condemnation: for God will judge thee according to thy deeds” (vv. 1, 2).

*1. Therefore thou art inexcusable.] Wherefore thou art without excuse* (see i. 20). With startling suddenness the Apostle states his conclusion first, merely hinting by the one word “wherefore” its dependence on the principle stated in i. 32, “that they which commit such things are worthy of death:” and then in the words “O man, whosoever thou art that judgest,” he singles out each reader as the very man addressed, and at the same time extends his argument to all, in order that he may eventually apply it to the Jew.

The success of such an appeal to conscience rests on the fact that every man recognizes in himself at least the germs of those sins which he condemns in others. St. Paul uses the argument with admirable skill and power: he has roused a just indignation by his description of flagrant sinners, and as the stern sentence of condemnation is bursting forth, he seizes and turns it back upon the judge himself. “The man that hath done this thing shall surely die.” “Thou art the man.”

The argument, set in its logical order, would stand thus: Thou judgest that they which do such things are worthy of death: Thou that judgest doest the same things: Therefore in judging thy neighbour thou condemnest thyself, and art without excuse. St. Paul inverts this order by using his conclusion first and proving it afterwards. The repeated description “thou that judgest,” though applicable to all men, is especially characteristic of the Jews, whose condemnation of “sinners of the Gentiles” (Gal. ii. 15) was unsparing.

ment of God is according to truth against them which commit such things.

3 And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?

The words "*O man,*" as in ix. 20, indirectly rebuke the presumption of a weak mortal in assuming the Divine prerogative of judgment. Compare Luke xii. 14.

The accusation brought in the words "thou doest the same things" is renewed against the Jew by name in vv. 17-27.

2. St. Paul now completes and confirms his argument by an express assertion of the principle, already assumed in it, that God's judgment against the *doers* of evil applies equally to all,—to those who judge even as to those who take pleasure in them that practise such things.

For the truth of this principle he appeals to the conscience of his readers (as in iii. 19): "*We know,*" it is a certain and well-known truth "that the judgment of God" (unlike that inconsistent judgment of man, v. 1) is directed "*according to truth,*" i.e., without error and without partiality (see v. 11) against the *doers* of evil.

3. *And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?* But thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which practise such things, and doest them, &c. In contrast to the sure truth of God's impartial judgment of evildoers, stand the errors by which men evade its application to themselves: and first, the delusive hope of personal exemption. "But thinkest thou this—that thou shalt escape being judged at all?" The folly of such a thought is made more prominent by the description of the person supposed to entertain it: "O man, that judgest them which practise such things, and doest them." Dost thou, who art thus inexcusable and self-condemned (v. 1), think that *thou* of all men shalt be exempt from judgment?

No answer is needed: as soon as the thought is clearly stated, its folly is transparent. Yet it is a common form of self-deception: men are almost unconsciously influenced by a vague and undefined hope of impunity which they do not acknowledge even to themselves. The Jews, however, openly claimed exemption from God's judgment as the common privilege of the children of Abraham. "All Israelites will have part in the world to come?" "Abraham sits be-

4 Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?

5 But after thy hardness and impenitent heart <sup>Jam. 5. 3</sup> treasures up unto

side the gates of hell, and does not permit any wicked Israelite to go down to hell." (See the citations in Bull's 'Harm. Apost.', cxvii. § 6, and in McCaul, 'Old Paths,' p. 450.) "They who are the seed of Abraham according to the flesh shall in any case, even if they be sinners and unbelieving and disobedient towards God, share in the eternal kingdom." (Just. Mart. 'Dial. c. Tryph.,' c. 140.) It is the same notion that is rebuked by John the Baptist, "*Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance: and think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father*" (Matt. iii. 8, 9.) Thus without naming the Jew St. Paul already indicates him by one of his most characteristic errors.

4. *Or despisest thou, &c.*] The Apostle now puts an alternative question, suggesting another explanation of the disregard which men show in practice to the acknowledged truth of a future judgment. The effect of God's patience upon a heart hardened in sin is only to produce a contemptuous feeling of security: "*Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil.*" (Eccles. viii. 11; Ps. x. 11, 13; Sirach v. 5, 6.) God's "goodness" is a gracious benignity that would gladly bless and not punish: His "forbearance" suspends the stroke, when sin cries for vengeance: His "long-suffering" endures repeated provocations and is still slow to anger. "*The riches of God's goodness*" he only can despise, who is ignorant of the purpose for which it is manifested: it is a moral blindness only that can mistake God's patience for a weakness or indifference from which final impunity may be expected (c. ix. 22). The Divine "goodness" is here presented in a twofold manner: There is not only a gracious disposition (*χρηστότης*) in God, that makes Him willing to lead sinners to repentance: the same gracious quality embodied in God's dealings (*τὸ χρηστόν*) has a real action in leading to repentance even those who nevertheless do not repent: God's leading is as real as man's resistance to being led.

5. The false views implied in the two preceding questions are now refuted by a direct assertion of the true nature and consequences of the impenitent sinner's conduct: the delu-

thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God;

6 <sup>d</sup>Who will render to every man <sup>a Ps. 62.</sup>  
<sup>b</sup>according to his deeds : <sup>c Matt. 16.</sup>  
 7 To them who by patient con- <sup>d Rev.</sup>  
<sup>e 22. 12.</sup>

sive hope of personal exemption (*v. 3*) is especially dealt with in *vv. 9 f.*; and the second error of despising God's goodness is thus at once exposed in a direct and vivid contrast. God's goodness leads to repentance; but an impenitent heart will not be led, and as an effect of this obduracy the store of wrath is increased by the *riches* of goodness rejected. The Apostle says not "God treasureth up wrath," but "*thou treasures up wrath unto thyself!*" "He adds to His long-suffering, thou to thine iniquity. . . . And what thou layest up a little every day, thou wilt find a mass hereafter." (Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps. 93.*)

*wrath against the day of wrath.]* Read "*wrath in the day of wrath.*" The expression sets forth with terrible emphasis the hardened sinner's doom. But while to him the Judgment Day is above all a day of wrath, it has also a more general character as a day which reveals to all, both good and evil, men and angels, that God is a righteous Judge (*δικαιοκρίτης*, 2 Macc. xii. 41); that not only in that last great act of judgment, but in all His dealings and dispensations, He judgeth righteously. This revelation of God's *character as a righteous Judge* (*δικαιοκρίτια*, v. Pseudo-Just. Mart. Quæst. Gent. 28), will consist in His rendering to every man according to his deeds.

6. This verse is an exact quotation from the Septuagint (Prov. xxiv. 12), and the same fundamental truth of a future universal judgment according to men's works, is constantly taught in the New Testament no less than in the Old (Matt. xvi. 27; xxv. 31-46; 2 Cor. v. 10). Against vain pretensions and imaginary privileges, St. Paul sets the acknowledged truth that God will judge and reward every man according to his actual life and true character.

The contrast here is not between works and faith, but between a man's deeds as realities and all that is unreal, between doing and knowing, between being and seeming, practising and professing. Thus we need not discuss modes of reconciling this passage with the doctrine that "*man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law*" (iii. 28). There can be no discrepancy, as the contrast between "faith" and "works of the law" has no place at this stage of the Apostle's argument. He is maintaining here that the rule of God's judgment will be real deeds of righteousness or unrighteousness. He will afterwards show that those "works of the law," which he

contrasts with faith, are not real works of righteousness.

Again, we must not on the one hand so strain the sense of the passage, as to infer that each man's deeds earn by their own intrinsic merit that reward which God will render; nor on the other hand limit the sense, as if the Apostle had written "Who will render to every man according to *the evidence of his deeds*" (Calovius, Meyer). What St. Paul means by the accordance between each man's deeds and his reward, he himself explains in the following verses, and no narrower limitation of his meaning is admissible. The closer definitions attempted in the interests of controversy rest on distinctions which are not contained in the Apostle's words, and are quite out of place in this stage of his argument. See notes on iv. 4, and Augustine, as there cited, and compare Acts x. 34, 35: "*Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.*"

7-10. The accordance between "the deeds done in the body" and the future reward is now shewn in two great classes into which all mankind are divided, according to the moral aim of their lives.

7. Some interpreters (as Reiche, Ewald, and Hofmann) would arrange the *verse* thus: — "To the one, seeking eternal life, he will render according to their patience in well-doing, glory and honour and immortality." They argue that the words "according to patience in well-doing," must answer to the clause "according to his works" (*v. 6*), and so must express "*the rule by which God will judge.*"

But the older interpretation followed by our translators is to be preferred, because it both preserves the natural order of the original words, and gives at least as good, perhaps a better, sense; for St. Paul, instead of merely repeating the statement that judgment shall be according to works, brings out a new thought, that the rule of God's future judgment must also be the rule of man's present life, and so the reward must be sought "*in the way of (κατά) patience in well-doing.*"

The last words might be rendered more exactly "*perseverance in good work;*" not this or that good work is meant, but the life of the righteous is viewed as a whole in its unity of purpose, as one good work patiently pursued (c. xiii. 3; Gal. vi. 4; 1 Pet. i. 17; Rev.

tinuance in well doing seek for glory and honour and immortality, eternal life :

8 But unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath,

9 Tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of

the Jew first, and also of the <sup>1</sup>Gen-<sup>#Gr.</sup>  
tile ;

10 But glory, honour, and peace, to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the <sup>II Gr.</sup>  
Gentile :

11 For there is no respect of persons with God.

12 For as many as have sinned

xii. 12). That this life of righteousness can be fully realized only in the Christian believer will be shewn at a later stage of the Apostle's argument (vi. 11-23). What he here sets forth is not the specific realization, but the general idea of the life which God will reward. Its form of outward manifestation will be "perseverance in good work;" its inner motive the longing after a higher state, in which man's perfected nature will shine forth in "glory," his faithfulness will be crowned with "honour," by God's approval, and his happiness secured for ever by the new gift of "immortality."

These three elements, "glory and honour and immortality," are combined in "eternal life," and our Authorized Version has the advantage of representing the various elements of happiness which man has longed for, as being all united in the reward which God will bestow.

8. *But unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth.]* "But unto them that are factious and disobey the truth." The unrighteous are described as "the men of factiousness," an idiom which represents "factiousness" as the root of their moral character. (See notes on iii. 26; iv. 12, 14; Gal. iii. 10.)

On the word *ἐριθεία* see Note at end of chapter. The context helps to define its meaning here: it is a "factiousness" which consists in "disobeying the truth, but obeying unrighteousness." Allegiance is due to "the truth" (which answers to righteousness, 1 Cor. xiii. 6; Eph. iv. 24; 2 Thess. ii. 10-12): to transfer this allegiance to the opposite power "unrighteousness" is factious.

*indignation and wrath.]* "There shall be wrath and indignation." To complete the sentence we must not supply as in v. 7, "God shall render," but both here and in vv. 9, 10, "there shall be." The sudden change is significant: "Salvation is God's own work, punishment will be the effect of the sinner's obduracy" (Ecumenius).

In the right order "wrath and indignation," the stronger word comes last, adding the idea of hot burning anger. St. Paul teaches us that the sense of God's wrath will

be a chief element in that "eternal destruction" (2 Thess. i. 9), which we might have expected him to name here as the opposite to "eternal life."

9, 10. St. Paul now repeats the thoughts of vv. 7, 8, with special emphasis upon the universality of the judgment as including Jews as well as Gentiles, and so refutes the Jewish error indicated in v. 3. The previous order of ideas is inverted, the thought of God's wrath against Sin being continued from v. 8; so that the words which describe the sinner's doom are heaped together with terrible effect.

That which coming from God appears under the form of "wrath and indignation," becomes when endured by the sinner, "tribulation and anguish."

The former word denotes the pressure of a crushing burden, the latter the "straitness" of confinement, and the consequent helplessness, which forbid all hope of escape.

"Every soul of man" is not a mere circumlocution for "every man:" such explanations rob language of half its life and power. It is the soul that suffers (Matt. xxvi. 38, Acts ii. 43), under the wrath of God, even when the pain reaches it through the body. See xiii. i.

The two words "worketh," v. 10, and "doeth," v. 9, fail to represent the distinction between the simple verb in the Greek, and its compound (*κατέπυγόσω*): punishment is inflicted on him who "worketh out evil" to its full end (v. 9): while he "that worketh good" is rewarded for the effort itself without reference to the successful accomplishment of the work. See vii. 15.

*the Jew first.]* The Jew, who is here first expressly included in the judgment, has a priority in responsibility and punishment, as well as in privilege and reward: see on i. 16. But this priority will not interfere with the application of the same rule of judgment according to every man's works.

*Gentile.]* "*Greek:*" See on i. 16.

11. The reason why Jew and Gentile will be judged by the same rule lies in that freedom from partiality, which is part of God's character as the Righteous Judge (Deut. x.

without law shall also perish without law : and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law ;

**13** (For not the hearers of the law

are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified.

**14** For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the

27; 2 Chron. xix. 7; Job xxxiv. 19). “To accept the face” was to give a gracious reception to a suitor or suitor (Gen. xix. 21; Job xiii. 10, xlvi. 8), and the phrase being often applied to a corrupt and partial judge (Lev. xix. 15, &c.) has always in the N. T. the bad sense of partiality (Matt. xxii. 16).

**12.** The Jew might be led by his actual privileges to doubt whether the principle that “*there is no respect of persons with God,*” could be applied to him. The Apostle therefore proceeds to show how a strict impartiality will be maintained in God’s future judgment of all men, whether Gentiles or Jews. A chief distinction between them was that the Jews had, and the Gentiles had not a revealed and written law of God; to such a law, therefore, St. Paul now applies the same argument from God’s judgment by works, which he has already used in vv. 1, 2, concerning a moral sense which enables a man to condemn sin in others, but does not restrain him from doing the same himself.

*For as many as have sinned without law.]* The Apostle deals with the Gentiles first. As their sin, so shall their punishment be: to neither of these will the standard of a written law be applied, and yet apart from all consideration of such law, as surely as a man sins, so surely shall he perish under the judgment of God. The want of the greater light gives no impunity to abuse of the less: but punishment follows as a natural consequence of sin under God’s general moral government. To “perish” in the future judgment is to lose what has been already described as “salvation,” “glory and honour and immortality,” “eternal life.”

*and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law.]* “And as many as have sinned with law shall be judged by law.” In stating the general principle of God’s judgment, St. Paul uses the term “law” without the article for any written revelation of God’s will; but, as in fact, there was no other such law given, but that of Moses, the sense is not materially affected by limiting the word “law” to “the law” of Moses, as in A.V. See Introduction, § 9.

The Jew, who could not dissent from the Apostle’s statement of the condition of the Gentile, is equally involved in condemnation under a judgment, which is impartial and according to works. For he possesses a law, and hears it read in the Synagogue on the

Sabbath day, and lives in professed obedience to it. Thus “law” constitutes the moral state in which he lives: if he sins, he sins “in” or under, or “with law,” and therefore “by law” he shall be judged.

**13.** The application of law as the rule of judgment, is an idea quite opposed to the fancied privilege and exemption of the Jews; St. Paul therefore confirms it by referring to the known principle of all law: “*for not they who are hearers of law*” (and nothing more than hearers) *shall be just before God, but the doers of law shall be justified.* This general principle is asserted by the Jewish law itself (Deut. xxvii. 26), and St. Paul here evidently assumes, as known to his readers, what he expresses elsewhere: “*For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, That the man which doeth those things shall live by them*” (x. 5).

The word “justified” is used here for the first time in the Epistle, and we cannot have a better opportunity of considering its meaning, which is clearly defined by the context.

(a) It cannot mean “*pardoned*” for he that is justified as a doer of law, has nothing to be pardoned for; nor (b) can it mean “*made just*” for he is just already by the supposition. It means to be “acknowledged and declared just;” it is the exact contrary to being “condemned.” There is no ground on which to condemn one who fulfills the law, he must therefore be justified. The word has evidently the same meaning in iii. 4, 20. In the present passage the meaning is confirmed by the parallel clause: “to be justified” is the same thing as “to be just before God,” i.e., according to his judgment (1 Cor. iii. 19; 2 Thess. i. 6).

**14-16.** St. Paul has shown how the general principle that God “will render to every man according to his works,” applies to the Jews: they will be judged by law, and only law-doers be justified. He now shows that the same principle is applicable to the Gentiles also, though under another form. For although they have no “law,” in the stricter sense of the word, that is to say, no revealed and written law like “the law” of Moses, yet substantially they have a law, or rather they “*are a law unto themselves.*”

Thus in vv. 14-16, St. Paul shows that the principle stated in v. 13 is in fact universal, and that the formal distinction between Gentile and Jew, v. 12, does not involve any

things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves :

<sup>1</sup> Or, the conscience <sup>between them,</sup> witnessing with them.

15 Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, <sup>1</sup> their conscience also bearing witness, and

their thoughts 'the mean while accusing or else excusing one another ;)

16 In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel.

essential difference between them in reference to the Divine Judgment. The real existence of the inward law in the Gentiles admits a double proof, the one derived from outward acts (*v. 14*), the other from the working of conscience (*v. 15*).

14. *For when the Gentiles.*] The sense of the verse is made clear by translating it with due attention to the use of the Greek Article: "For whenever Gentiles which have not a law, do by nature the things of the law, these not having a law are a law unto themselves." It is clear that here, as throughout the chapter, the Gentiles of whom St. Paul speaks are heathen; and by "nature," as contrasted with the teaching of an outward law, he means the moral faculty, which is born with every man, however much or little it may be afterwards developed. But the Apostle does not speak of "the Gentiles" as a whole, nor of their rendering a complete obedience; occasional good deeds, such as "the law" approves, done by persons who have neither that nor any other outward law, are sufficient proof of an inward principle, by virtue of which such persons are "a law unto themselves." It is remarkable that St. Paul here uses the exact words of Aristotle, who says concerning men of eminent virtue and wisdom: *κατὰ δὲ τῶν τρούπων οὐν̄ ἔστι νόμος αἰτοὶ γάρ εἰσι νόμος* ('Polit.' III. xiii. 14). The first clause is quoted in Gal. v. 23 and the second here. Compare also Arist. 'Eth. Nicom.' iv. 8 (14) ὁ δῆλος καὶ ἀειθέρειος οὐτὸς ἔξει, οὐν̄ νόμος ὡν̄ ἐαυτῷ, in reference to jesting.

15. *Which shew.*] "Inasmuch as they show." Gentiles, such as have been described in *v. 14*, are proved to be a law unto themselves, because in their good deeds they shew that "the work of the law," though not its word, the substance though not the form, is "written in their hearts" by the finger of Him who made them. Compare Sanderson, 'De Obligatione Conscientiae,' iv. 25, and Cic. 'de Rep.' iii. 22: "Est quidem vera lex recta ratio naturae congruens, diffusa in omnes, constans, sempiterna, qua vocet ad officium jubendo, vetando a fraude deterreat."

*their conscience also.*] With the outward evidence of acts done in accordance with the law there agrees also (*Ἐνυμαρτυρούσης*) an inner witness, the moral sense, exercising itself

upon men's own acts and upon those of their fellows. The Authorized Version is inaccurate in rendering *μεταξύ* here "the meanwhile;" translate thus:—"their own conscience joining witness, and between one another their thoughts accusing or else excusing (them)."

How does St. Paul's use of the word conscience correspond to the modern use? and what difference, it may be asked, is there between "the work of the law written on the heart," and "the conscience bearing witness?" The former is the suggestive or prospective conscience that spontaneously forbids or commands prior to action; the latter is the subsequent or reflective conscience that passes judgment on deeds done, either by ourselves or others. Compare Fleming, 'Vocab. of Philosophy,' Art. 'Conscience.' "This faculty is called into exercise not merely in reference to our own conduct, but also in reference to the conduct of others. It is not only reflective but prospective, in its operations. It is *antecedent* as well as *subsequent* to action, in its exercise; and it is occupied *de faciendo*, as well as *de facto*." See also Mansel, 'Prolegomena Logica,' Appendix, note F. Sanderson, 'De Conscientia,' I. § 27.

16. There is no need to put *vv. 13–15* in a parenthesis, so as to connect *v. 16* directly with *v. 12*. The words "in the day," &c., refer to the whole subject discussed, from *v. 12*, or even from *v. 6*, to *v. 15*. The same words are appended in the same informal, but impressive, manner in 2 Thess. i. 10.

That *vv. 14, 15*, are not unconnected with *v. 16*, is seen in the thought that "the secrets of men" shall be judged; the Divine judgment shall penetrate to the inner sphere of conscience, and correspond to "the work of the law written on the heart."

Why does St. Paul say, "according to my Gospel?" His arguments hitherto have been drawn from principles universally admitted; a judgment too of some kind was acknowledged both by Jews and Greeks; but that Jesus Christ would be the Judge, by neither. This is a distinctive doctrine of the Gospel (John v. 22; Acts x. 42; xvii. 31; 1 Cor. iv. 5); and as St. Paul has already, in his introduction (i. 1–5, 9, 15, 16), spoken of the preaching of that Gospel as the work to which he was set apart, he here very naturally calls it "my Gospel," on the first occasion of bringing

<sup>For, first  
the things  
that differ.</sup> 17 Behold, thou art called a Jew,  
and restest in the law, and makest  
thy boast of God,

18 And knowest his will, and <sup>ap-</sup>

provest the things that are more ex-  
cellent, being instructed out of the  
law;

19 And art confident that thou

forward in his argument one of its peculiar doctrines. For other interpretations see Note at the end of the chapter.

17-27. The minor premiss of the syllogism in verse 1, “Thou judgest doest the same things,” is here proved against the Jew by name.

17-24. *Behold.*] — Read “But if.” The dramatic “Behold!” is not unsuited to the “splendid and vehement eloquence” of this apostrophe; but the connection is made clearer by the right reading.

“But” implies that the conduct to be described is opposed to the principle just established, that not the hearers, but the doers of the law shall be justified. In v. 17-20 a supposition is made (“if”) in which the boasted privileges of the Jew (17, 18), and his assumed superiority over others (19, 20), are for the moment admitted; and then a series of pungent questions, founded on these admissions (“Thou then,” v. 21), and put in startling contrast with them, brings out the flagrant inconsistency between profession and practice (21, 22).

If with the Authorized Version, and most editors, we make v. 23 also a question, we must suppose that this and the preceding questions are regarded as admitting no possible denial. But in the Greek a slight change of construction from the Participle to the Relative (v. 23), probably indicates the transition from the series of questions to the assertion which gives a comprehensive answer to them all, and closes the searching inquiry with a decisive condemnation (Meyer, Lange). The verdict, whether thus declared in v. 23 or assumed after it, is confirmed in v. 24, by its accordance with the language of the Old Testament, in such passages as Isaiah iii. 5, Ezekiel xxxvi. 20-23.

17. *art called a Jew.*] The name Jew, which first occurs in 2 Kings xvi. 6, was extended after the captivity to the whole people, and as distinguishing them from the heathen, was associated with national prerogative and Messianic hopes. The Jew, therefore, is represented as priding himself upon his national name (*vv. 28, 29; ix. 4; Gal. ii. 15; Rev. ii. 9; iii. 9.*)

*restest in the law.*] “**Restest upon law.**” As the confidence of the Jew reposed on the mere fact of God’s having given him a law, not on the particular character of the law so given, the more exact translation is

“restest upon law;”<sup>1</sup> the Greek article is omitted by the critical editors. Compare v. 25, and Introduction, § 9.

The real foundation of the prerogative of the Jews was the promise given to Abraham, the covenant of the law being subordinate and temporary. But the Jew had lost sight of this truth, and because God “shewed his word unto Jacob, his statutes and judgments unto Israel, and had not dealt so with any nation” (Ps. cxlvii. 19) the Jew rested supinely upon the possession of a law as an assurance of God’s favour, instead of using it as a rule of life, and a light to the conscience. The same Greek word is used in the Septuagint (Mic. iii. 11), “Yet will they lean upon the Lord, and say, Is not the Lord among us? none evil can come upon us.”

The same spirit is indicated in the next clause.

*and makest thy boast of God.]* “**and boastest in God.**” An arrogant perversion of the glorying which God commands, “Let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth Me, that I am the Lord which exercise loving-kindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the Lord.” This passage of Jeremiah (ix. 24) may have been in St. Paul’s mind; for the last clause rendered in the LXX., “in these is my will,” τὸ θέλημα μου, seems to be echoed in his next words.

18. *And knowest his will.*] Literally, “the will,” which may mean either simply “his will,” as in A. V., or perhaps by way of excellence, “the one perfect will.” See Barrow, Serm. iv. p. 34, and note on Acts v. 41. Dr. Lightfoot (‘Revision of New Testament,’ p. 106) shews that θέλημα, even without the Article, means the Divine Will in 1 Cor. xvi. 12, and in several Epistles of St. Ignatius.

*and approvest the things that are more excellent.]* Δοκιμάζω means (1) to “test,” “prove,” “discern” (c. xii. 2; 1 Cor. iii. 13; xi. 28; 2 Cor. viii. 8, &c.); and (2) to “approve” as the result of testing (c. i. 28; xiv. 22; 1 Cor. xvii. 3; 1 Thess. ii. 4; and especially Phil. i. 10, εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τὰ διαφέροντα).

Many interpreters prefer the former meaning here, and understand by διαφέροντα “the things that differ,” either morally, as good and evil, or that differ from “the will” of God. But these interpretations are very

thyself art a guide of the blind, a light of them which are in darkness,

20 An instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, which hast the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law.

21 Thou therefore which teachest

another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal?

22 Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?

feeble when compared with that of the Vulgate and A. V. It would be a small thing to say of the Jew who prides himself on possessing the law and knowing the will of God, that he discerns the difference between good and evil. What St. Paul says is much more: "thou approvest (in theory) the more excellent things." The Jew thus says, as it were, of himself, "Video meliora—proboque," and feels that this refinement of his moral sentiment is an advantage which he derives from "being instructed out of the law," which was publicly read and explained to him on the Sabbath. See below on v. 20.

Though the language is just what the Jew would have used to describe himself, there is in the Apostle's use of it a latent irony which becomes more strongly marked in the following verses. Here the Jew's own privileges are enumerated; there the claims of superiority over others which he founded upon those privileges.

19. *And art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind.*] It was part of God's purpose in choosing Israel that they should become the witnesses and teachers of His truth: their sin lay in making a vain boast of the privilege, instead of fulfilling the duty. The language is such as was current among the Jews in regard to proselytes, and to the heathen generally; but St. Paul heaps phrase upon phrase, and "is lavish in what seem to be their praises," to strengthen the contrast, "exalting the one and abasing the other, that he may smite the more sharply, and make his accusation heavier." (Chrysostom.)

20. *which hast.*] Rather, as having. As in v. 18, so here again more emphatically, the law is brought forward as the ground of this presumptuous confidence: "*Thou art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind . . . as having the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law.*"

"*The form*" (*μόρφωσις*, "formation") here means the ideally perfect presentation of knowledge and truth, the outward conformation answering to their inner nature (Chrysostom, Grotius, Meyer, Ewald, Fritzsche, Philippi). It is not opposed to the substance as the unreal to the real, or the outward to the inward; for not even St. Paul himself, much less the Jew, whose thoughts he is here

expressing, believed that in the law there was a mere empty form of knowledge. The Jew believed that he had in the law the sole embodiment of all knowledge and truth in their most perfect "form," or (if we must express the Active sense of the original word), that he possessed in the law "the forming of knowledge and truth," that he could give to knowledge and truth their right form, and so was the proper teacher of the world. (Sirach xxiv. 8—12.) Compare Rabbi Artom, *Sermons* (1873) p. 110: "If the earth is to be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea, it must be through our agency. We must infuse that knowledge: we possess the best materials for that instruction, and we must make it a duty and a glory to enlighten the world."

21. "At length the Apostle turns to strike." (Jowett.)

The arrogant claims and professions of the Jew, as just described, are strangely inconsistent with his actual conduct; and it is this inconsistency that forms the ground of the Apostle's questions.

The whole course of thought, and the two sins first specified—theft and adultery—seem to be suggested by Psalm l. 16: "*What hast thou to do to declare my statutes, or that thou shouldst take my covenant in thy mouth? Seeing thou hatest instruction, and castest my words behind thee. When thou sawest a thief, then thou consentedst with him, and hast been partaker with adulterers.*"

We need not suppose, therefore, that these sins were *more* flagrant at this time among the Jews than at other times, or among other nations; but that they *were* flagrant is both historically certain, and implied in St. Paul's argument.

The teaching and preaching is not that of official persons only, but all the Jews are addressed as one person; a loud and ostentatious denunciation of sin was part of the national character.

*Thou therefore.] "Thou then."* See on vv. 17—24.

*dost thou commit sacrilege?] "dost thou rob temples?"* The third offence charged is sacrilege, or temple-robbing. But does St. Paul mean to charge the Jews with robbing heathen temples, or their own temple?

**23** Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God?

**24** For the name of God is blas-

phemed among the Gentiles through you, as it is "written."

<sup>a</sup> Is. 52, 5  
Ezek. 36, 23.

**25** For circumcision verily pro-

Does he refer to breaches of the law laid down in Deut. vii. 25, 26, and repeated by Josephus ('Ant.' iv. c. 8, § 10), "Rob not foreign temples, nor take an offering inscribed with the name of any god?" Or, does he mean that the Jews robbed God of His offerings (Mal. i. 8, 12, 13, and iii. 8-10) and by their extortion and fraud made His temple "a den of thieves"? To these latter practices the original word is not elsewhere applied, perhaps is hardly applicable; and the mention of "the idols" in the opening clause, points decisively to the robbing of idol temples. Compare Acts xix. 57.

Sharp as the contrast is between theory and practice in the former questions, the sarcasm here reaches a climax of severity. Idols and all things belonging to them were by the law utterly accursed and abominable; yet covetousness could prevail even over the abhorrence of idols.

This interpretation is confirmed by v. 24, which shews that the sins specified are such as would fall under the notice of the heathen; and nothing would more surely make them blaspheme God's name than the robbery of their temples by those who made their boast of God.

**23.** *Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God!* **24.** *Thou that gloriest in law, by thy transgression of the law dishonourest God.*

The first clause is a summary of vv. 17-20, the last a decisive answer to "the four questions of reproachful astonishment" (Meyer), in vv. 21, 22. The contrast between privilege and practice that runs through the whole passage is thus used again, to increase the force of the final condemnation.

**24.** The statement that the Jew by his transgression of "the law," dishonours "the God" who gave it, is now confirmed and explained in language borrowed from Isaiah iii. 5, but applied in a new sense. The Prophet means that because God's people are suffered to fall under the oppression of their enemies, these last hold His name in contempt. St. Paul's meaning is that the vices and sins of the Jew make his religion and his God contemptible in the sight of the heathen. There is nothing in the Hebrew of Isaiah corresponding to the words "among the Gentiles;" but they occur repeatedly in a passage of Ezekiel (xxxvi. 21-23), which

seems also to have been in the Apostle's mind, and they are naturally suggested by the last clause of v. 22. The addition thus made by St. Paul to the words of Isaiah, seems to have crept into the Septuagint Version of the original passage; a more remarkable instance of interpolation, due to the same cause, will be observed in the next chapter. See note on iii. 13 ff.

*through you.] Because of you.*

**25-29.** It has been shown that none but doers of the law shall be justified, and that the Jew, though making his boast in the law, is not a doer of it (12-24). But no mention has yet been made of his other great privilege, circumcision; if this is the seal of an unconditional blessing, he may yet escape. St. Paul, therefore, goes on to confirm and complete his preceding argument, by showing that the benefit of circumcision depends on the same condition as that of the law.

**25.** "*For circumcision I admit is of use if thou practise law; but if thou be a transgressor of law, thy circumcision has become uncircumcision.*" The Article is wanting, because "the stress is laid, not upon the *law* which God gave, but upon *law as given by God*" (Cremer). What St. Paul requires is the practice of moral obedience, "if thou be a law-doer." Compare note on v. 13; Lightfoot, 'Gal.' ii. 19, iv. 5, and Dr. Vaughan's good note on this passage.

St. Paul is not here stating the necessity for an exact fulfilment of the whole law, and the effect of an individual act of transgression; he supposes in the one case an habitual practical regard to law (*πράττειν νόμον*), and in the other an habitual transgression of it. He is describing, not the condition on which a Jew could *earn* righteousness, but that on which he might hope for a promised blessing. The nature of this blessing is explained afterwards (iv. 11; ix. 4). The effect of habitual transgression is that the covenant is annulled; circumcision has thereby become uncircumcision, so far as any benefit from it is concerned. St. Paul's words of course bear this figurative meaning, but similar language is used in a literal sense by the Rabbis: "Let not heretics, apostates, and impious men, who are Israelites, say, 'Since we are circumcised, we go not down to hell.' What then does the Holy and Blessed God? He sends an angel, and turns their circumcision into uncircumcision, so that even they go down to

thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision.

26 Therefore if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision?

27 And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the

law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law?

28 For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is *that* circumcision, which is outward in the flesh:

29 But he *is* a Jew, which is one

hell." (Schemoth Rabb. ap. Schöttgen.) Compare Lightfoot, 'Horæ Hebr.', on 1 Cor. viii. 18.

26. The same principle rules the converse case of the Gentile: if obedience is so much more important than circumcision that the latter is useless without the former, may we not infer that the want of circumcision may be supplied by obedience?

The inference is expressed as a question to which no denial can be given.

*Therefore if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law.] "If then the uncircumcision keep the ordinances of the law."*

Ordinances (*δικαιώματα*) mean here moral requirements. See note on i. 32.

The expression "*his uncircumcision*," clearly proves that St. Paul is not thinking of the "uncircumcision" as a whole, but only of this or that uncircumcised person. Nor is he speaking of "an impossible case" (Alford), *i.e.* of such an entire fulfilment of all "the righteous demands" of the law as no man can render; he is supposing, as in v. 14, the possible case that a heathen might render just such an obedience to the moral law as a pious Jew might and ought to render; and argues that the Gentile's uncircumcision would not make his obedience the less acceptable. If he do right, and so far as he does right, he shall share in the mercy covenanted to the pious Jew (Matt. viii. 11; 1 Cor. vii. 19; Gal. v. 6). It is not circumcision, therefore, that the Gentile wants.

27. *And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law?*

Render: *And the natural uncircumcision fulfilling the law shall judge thee, that with Scripture and circumcision art a transgressor of law.*

In the A. V. this verse, as well as v. 26, is treated as a question; it has greater force as an answer, taking up and enlarging the subject-matter of the question. On this form of answer, see Jelf's 'Greek Grammar,' 880, i.

In the A. V., "*if it fulfil the law*" is a needless repetition of the hypothesis made in

v. 26. The disobedience of the Jew and the obedience of the Gentile supposed in vv. 25, 26, are here both assumed.

"*The natural uncircumcision*" means the Gentile, this or that individual, who remains as he was by nature, uncircumcised. Such an one, fulfilling the law, shall by contrast judge the Jew that transgresses it.

The Jew, that was so ready to judge others (*ό κρίων*, v. 1), is thus himself brought to judgment.

"*Scripture*" seems more suitable than "letter," which is too narrow. The contrast is not between "letter" and "spirit," as in v. 29, but between "a *written law*," and the unwritten law of nature (v. 14).

Accordingly, there is no disparagement of the written law; rather it is regarded, like circumcision (v. 28), as an advantageous circumstance to the Jew, but one under which, through his own fault, he comes to no better result than being a transgressor.

For a similar use of the Greek preposition *διά* to denote the attendant circumstances, see iv. 11; xiv. 20.

28, 29. The reason why circumcision avails so little in the case just discussed (25–27) is, that it is not the true circumcision of the heart, but only the sign, without the grace.

28. This verse is well rendered in A. V. In v. 29, the Subjects only are expressed in the Greek, and the Predicates must be mentally repeated from v. 28, thus: "But he which is inwardly a Jew (is truly a Jew), and circumcision of heart in spirit not in letter (is true circumcision)."

"*Circumcision of heart*," as a figurative expression for inward purity, is as old as the Book of Deuteronomy. See x. 16; xxx. 6; and Jerem. ix. 26. In the N. T. the idea is found only in St. Stephen's memorable speech, and in St. Paul's Epistles.

The element in which this true circumcision takes place is "*spirit*"; that is, the inner life which man lives under the influence of the Divine Spirit.

In contrast to this, "*letter*" is the mere outward element of written law; and circumcision "*in spirit not in letter*," is a circumcision which does not stop short at

inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in

outward conformity to the law, but extends to the sphere of the inner life. Compare vii. 6, 2 Cor. iii. 6.

[*whose praise is not of men, but of God.*] It is not at first sight apparent why St. Paul has added the clause, "*Whose praise is not from men, but from God.*" But we must remember that he began his address to the Jew in v. 17, by an allusion to the name on which he prided himself, "*thou art called a Jew,*" and that he has just described in this verse the Jew that is worthy to be so-called. What, then, can be more natural, or more

the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.

like St. Paul's style, than a renewed reference to the meaning of the name Jew? When Leah bare her fourth son she said, "*Now will I praise the Lord: therefore she called his name Judah*" (Gen. xxix. 35).

When Jacob lay a-dying, this was the beginning of his blessing upon Judah: "*Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise*" (Gen. xlvi. 8).

St. Paul, in like manner alluding to the meaning of the name, says of the true Jew that his *praise is not from men, but from God.*

#### ADDITIONAL NOTES on verses 8 and 16.

**8. τοῖς ἐξ ἐργασίας.**] See Fritzsche's elaborate excursus on this passage.

ἐργάτης, a labourer, a hireling.

ἐργθέω, to act as a hireling, i.e. in a mercenary self-seeking spirit (ἐργάζομαι μὲν τι τῷ πραγμάτερῳ μὴ βούλησθείς, Schol. ad Soph. Aj. 833).

Hence ἐργάζομαι (Arist. Polit. v. 3) and ἐξεργάζομαι (Polyb. x. 22, 9) have the sense of canvassing or hiring partisans and forming factions in the State; and ἐργασία (Arist. Polit. v. 2 and 3 p. 1302, and p. 1303) means a self-seeking ambitious rivalry, party spirit, or factiousness.

It is so explained by Suidas; and Chrysostom, Theodore, and Theophylact interpret it as "contentiousness" or "factiousness," a meaning which is easily adapted to the context in the N. T. passages (Rom. ii. 8; 2 Cor. xii. 20; Gal. v. 20; Phil. i. 17, ii. 3; Ja. iii. 14, 16).

**16. according to my gospel.]** The right interpretation is given by Origen, who, after remarking that the secrets of men can be judged only by God who searcheth the heart, proceeds thus: "Which judgment nevertheless according to the gospel of Paul, that is, the gospel which Paul preaches, will take place through Jesus Christ: '*for the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son.*'"

This interpretation is confirmed by the other two passages in which St. Paul uses the expression "*my gospel,*" in both of which he refers to distinctive and fundamental doctrines of the Gospel which he preached, namely in xvi. 25 to the extension of Christ's kingdom to the Gentiles, and in 2 Tim. ii. 8 to the resurrection and Davidic descent of Christ.

Calvin's comment, "He calls it his gospel in reference to his ministry," though not

sufficient here, is quite applicable to 2 Thess. ii. 14, and 2 Cor. iv. 3.

Others less correctly regard κατὰ τὸ εὐγνωμόν μου as expressing the rule by which God will judge.

Thus Meyer: "Paul was so certain of the sole truth of the Gospel committed to him (xvi. 25; Eph. iv. 20 f.) which he had by revelation of God (Gal. i. 11 f.) that he could not but be equally certain that the future judgment would not be held otherwise than *according to his Gospel*, whose contents are conceived as the *standard of the sentence*." But the standard has been already stated in v. 13; God will judge every man "*according to his works*": and the thought that the Gospel preached by St. Paul will be the standard by which God will judge Jews and Gentiles is very inappropriate at this stage of the argument.

Lange: "The day on which God judges the secrets of men according to the Gospel of Paul, is the day when the Apostle preaches the gospel to them." This explanation is excluded by the evident fact that the whole context points to the day of final judgment.

The notion that by "*my gospel*" St. Paul means the Gospel according to St. Luke is mentioned by Eusebius, 'H. E.' III. iv., in a way which implies that he gave no credit to it (*φασίν δὲ ὡς ἄπι κ. τ. λ.*).

That he cannot mean to characterize his Gospel as different from that preached by the other Apostles, is evident from the fact that they also from the first had announced as a distinctive doctrine of the Gospel that Christ would come again to judge the world. (Acts iii. 19-21; x. 42; compare Matt. xxv. 31; John v. 22.)

## CHAPTER III.

**I** The Jews' prerogative: 3 which they have not lost: 9 howbeit the law convinceth them also of sin: 20 therefore no flesh is justified by the law, 28 but all, without difference, by faith only: 31 and yet the law is not abolished.

## CHAP. III.—I-8. THE JEW'S OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

St. Paul has shown that the Jew's superior knowledge of God was useless, without practical obedience (ii. 17-24), and that circumcision without inward purity was no better than uncircumcision (ii. 25-29).

Yet the people whom God had chosen for Himself out of all nations, must have some real advantage over the heathen; and the covenant, of which circumcision was the sign, must confer some benefit, for God Himself was the author of it.

St. Paul expresses these thoughts in the opening questions of ch. iii., in a form which assumes the reality of Jewish privilege.

*1. What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision?]* “What then is the advantage of the Jew? Or what the benefit of circumcision?”

The summary answer, “Much every way,” is not the boast of an imaginary Jewish opponent, whose argument (1-3) is cut short by St. Paul in v. 4: but it is the Apostle's own conviction, as is clear from the parallel passage, ix. 4, 5. While exposing with just severity the Jew's hollow pretences to personal merit or impunity, he yet recognizes with the spirit of a true Israelite the good gifts which God had bestowed upon His people. Compare Deut. xxxiii. 29.

*2. chiefly, because that unto them were committed, &c.]* “For first [it is much] that they were entrusted with the oracles of God.” St. Paul does not expressly say, as in A.V., that the possession of the oracles of God was the Jew's chief advantage, but implies as much by giving it the first place in his intended enumeration of the blessings of the covenant. Compare Ps. cxlvii. 19, 20: “He sheweth his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel. He hath not dealt so with any nation.”

The name “oracles,” is applied in the New Testament only to the revelations made to Moses (Acts vii. 38), and to the Divine utterances generally (Heb. v. 12; 1 Pet. iv. 11).

“I am not unaware,” writes Philo, “that all the things which are written in the sacred books are oracles delivered by him (Moses): and I will set forth what more peculiarly

WHAT advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision?

**2** Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God.

**3** For what if some did not be-

concerns him, when I have mentioned this one point, namely, that of the sacred oracles some are represented as delivered in the person of God by His interpreter, the divine prophet, while others are put in the form of question and answer, and others are delivered by Moses in his own character as a divinely prompted lawgiver, possessed by divine inspiration.” (Life of Moses, c. xxiii.) Compare “On the Virtues and Office of Ambassadors,” c. xxxi.) The corresponding term in the Old Testament (**לְשׁוֹנוֹת**, **rā̄lōyā tō̄v Θεō̄v**) is used of any Divine revelations (Num. xxiv. 4, 16), of the precepts of God's Law (Ps. cxvii. 11; cxix. 148, 158), and especially of God's promises (Ps. cxix. 38, 49, where see notes).

That which gave to “the oracles of God” in the Old Testament their highest value was the promise of salvation in Christ, which ran through the Law and the Prophets: and that promise being made, not to one generation, but to “Abraham and his seed for ever,” not to one nation, but to “all the nations of the earth,” the oracles which contained it were a trust committed to the Jews for the common benefit of mankind.

And over and above their share in the general promise, the Jews had a great and special advantage in having this trust committed to them.

For the trust not only brought with it the various blessings which distinguished the Jews under the old covenant above all the nations of the earth, but was further accompanied by special and peculiar promises given to the Jews as a nation, that they should themselves be heirs of the promised salvation. And this natural prerogative has not been, and cannot be, lost, as St. Paul proceeds to show,—thus dropping the enumeration of other privileges.

*3. For what if some did not believe? shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect?]* For what if some disbelieved? shall their want of faith make the faithfulness of God of none effect? St. Paul is not speaking, as some have supposed, of disobedience to the Law, or unfaithfulness to the covenant, but of disbelief of the oracles and their fulfilment in Christ. The Greek word does not mean “disobedience,” but “unbelief.” Nor could it be supposed that the

lieve? shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect?

4 God forbid: yea, let God be true, but every man a liar; as it is written, <sup>b</sup>That thou might-

<sup>a</sup> Ps. 51. 4.

est be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged.

5 But if our unrighteousness commend the righteousness of God, what

disobedience of former generations had forfeited the national privilege: for the promise had been renewed from age to age as long as prophecy continued. All former unbelief did but foreshadow and prepare the great national apostasy now well-nigh accomplished in the rejection of Christ by the Jews. This subject, here briefly touched to meet a possible objection, is the main theme of ch. ix.—xi. And we there see how anxious St. Paul was to assure himself and others that “*the gifts and calling of God are without repentance*,” and that His faithfulness would surely accomplish His promises to Israel in the ages to come. Thus in the question, “**Shall their want of faith make the faithfulness of God of none effect?**” the future tense has its simple and proper meaning.

Even the present unbelief of the Jews was not universal: “*Some did not believe;*” “*some of the branches were broken off*” (xi. 17); “*blindness in part is happened to Israel*” (xi. 25).

This is not an inaccurate mode of speaking, nor an attempt to soften down an unwelcome truth; still less is it an expression of irony or contempt, as though unbelievers, however many, were of little account. For St. Paul is not distinguishing between “some” and “many,” but between “some” and “all;” not thinking of the comparative number of Jewish believers and unbelievers in his own generation, but looking forward to the time when “*all Israel shall be saved*” (xi. 26).

It is to be remarked that “*some*” in the original signifies a part of the whole, but not necessarily a small part of it. It may be a very great part and majority of the whole,—as in Hebrews iii. 16, where it is said, “*Some when they heard provoked, howbeit not all that came out of Egypt with Moses.*” All did provoke God on that occasion except Joshua and Caleb, and those who were still too young to bear arms . . (Chalmers.) The question being, What is the advantage of the Jew? the *some* must be some of the Jews. In every generation there were a few found faithful, and so in the generation to which the Gospel was preached. And though the great majority of that generation, and of all that have succeeded it, did not believe, still the nation is not finally rejected (xi. 1, 25, 26). Moreover, even in the case of those who did not believe, God’s promise was proved faithful: they had the advantage, though they would not use it.

4. *God forbid: yea, let God be true.*] Not so be it: but let God be true. It is not enough to reject with righteous abhorrence ( $\mu\eta\gamma\gamma\epsilon\omega\tau\omega$ ) the thought that the unbelief of some could make void God’s faithfulness to others. God’s truth is absolute and independent; it cannot be impaired, even if man’s falsehood be universal.

Nay more, God’s truth is the only truth: it will be found in the end that He alone is holy and righteous, and every man, in himself, unholy and unrighteous. So let it be: “*let God be true, but every man a liar.*”

The last clause, expressed in the exact words of Ps. cxvi. 11 (Septuagint), is an essential part of the argument, that truth must be ascribed to God, and none but God.

St. Paul adopts the apt words of the Psalmist to express his own thought, and this is why for “*unbelief*” and “*faithfulness*” (v. 3) he now substitutes the correlative ideas “*truth*” and “*falsehood*;” these again give place to “*righteousness*” and “*sin*” in the quotation which follows from the 51st Psalm.

It is clear, from the objection introduced in v. 5, that St. Paul quotes the words of David as a declaration that man’s sin serves to establish God’s righteousness.

And this is David’s own meaning, when he says, “*Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned . . . that thou mightest be justified.*” (See note ix. 17, Hupfeld and Perowne on Ps. li. 4, and Winer’s Gk. Gr. l.iii.) When David’s conscience is awakened, he beholds his sin in its most heinous aspect as essentially opposed to the holiness of God: and in that opposition he sees that his own sin serves to establish the truth that God alone is righteous.

We have thus a fine climax in the Apostle’s thoughts: “Shall the unbelief of some make void the faithfulness of God? Nay, let God alone be found true, and *all* men false: for the sin of man serves to show that “*holiness belongeth unto God.*” This is no digression: for it is over the self-righteousness of the Jew that St. Paul must win his way to the great truth that “*all have sinned*” (9, 19).

5. The truth stated in vv. 3, 4, might easily be perverted into a false claim of impunity. If the unrighteousness of us men establishes and commands God’s righteousness, what conclusion shall be drawn?

The term “*righteousness of God*” here

shall we say? *Is God unrighteous who taketh vengeance?* (I speak as a man)

6 God forbid: for then how shall God judge the world?

7 For if the truth of God hath

more abounded through my lie unto his glory; why yet am I also judged as a sinner?

8 And not rather, (as we be slanderously reported, and as some affirm that we say,) Let us do evil, that

denotes the Divine attribute in its comprehensive sense, as including God's faithfulness (*v. 3*) and truth (*v. 4*). The argument is capable of universal application, but is here aimed at the conscience of the Jew, from whom the Apostle would cut off all false pretexts of impunity.

*Is God unrighteous who taketh vengeance? Is God that inflicteth his wrath unrighteous?* We know that God's wrath is revealed against unrighteousness (*i. 18, ii. 8*): “Is He as the inflicter of that wrath unrighteous? Is it unjust in Him to punish the sin that confirms the sole glory of His righteousness?”

*Is God unrighteous?* The very form of the question, in the Greek, implies that the answer must be negative. And yet even in this form St. Paul cannot state such a thought as coming from his own mind: “*I speak*,” he says, “*as a man*,” i.e. “*according to the foolish and unworthy thoughts of God*, entertained by *man*.”

6. When he begins to speak as a Christian teacher, according to his own higher standard, he can only reject such a thought as impious: “*God forbid!* For, (if God that inflicteth his wrath is therein unjust,) *how shall God judge the world?*”

The argument is very simple; it does not go beyond the limits of the thought in Gen. xviii. 25, “*Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?*”

The supposition of injustice in God's infliction of his wrath is directly contrary to the fundamental truth that God shall “judge the world in righteousness” (*Heb. vi. 2; Acts xvii. 31*).

That truth as one of the first elements of religion is so certain, that whatever contradicts it must of necessity be false. Thus by a rapid appeal to the first elements of religion, St. Paul is content to show that the supposition of injustice in the punishment of sin, because it establishes God's righteousness, must be false. Where the fallacy lay in the process of reasoning that could lead to such a false influence, he does not stop to show. The explanation commonly given is that God's righteousness is established not by sin in itself, but by sin as dealt with by God, punished by His holy vengeance, pardoned by His grace, or overruled to good effect by His wisdom.

A simpler view and more suited to the context is, that as the sinner does not wish or intend to establish God's righteousness, no merit for this result is due to his sin, which remains under an undiminished curse.

“We cannot say truly that *as God to his own glory did ordain our happiness, and to accomplish our happiness appoint the gifts of His grace, so He did ordain to His glory our punishment, and for matter of punishment our sin.* For punishment is to His will no desired end, but a consequent ensuing sin; and in regard of sin, His glory an event thereof, but no proper effect, which answereth fully that repining proposition,—‘If man's sin be God's glory, why is God angry?’” (Hooker, ‘E. P.’, Bk. V., App. No. I.; 2nd ed. Keble, vol. ii. p. 572) Compare also Archbishop King, ‘Origin of Evil,’ vol. ii. p. 440.

7. The argument of *v. 6* is continued. If, because sin commands the righteousness of God, it is unjust for Him to punish the sinner, all judgment becomes impossible. For I, or any man, may on this ground protest against being judged, and plead thus at the last day:—If God's truth was more abundantly manifested by my lie, and His glory thereby increased, is not that enough? Why farther am I also, on my side, brought to judgment as a sinner?

The tenses shew that the scene is laid at the last Judgment; and the emphatic pronouns in “*my lie*,” and “*I also*,” set clearly before us the individual sinner on one side, and God on the other.

For the general term “sin,” or “unrighteousness” (*v. 5*), “*lie*” is used in reference to the words “*every man a liar*,” in *v. 4*. “*The truth of God*,” as His attribute, is not capable of increase, but it may abound more unto His glory by being more fully manifested in the contrast with man's sin.

8. The false plea, just proved to be inconsistent with the certain truth of a future Judgment, is now shown to be destructive of all morality. The sinner, who speaks in *v. 7*, is about to continue his daring protest, Why am I judged? and why may I not do evil that good may come?

But the thought occurs to St. Paul, that the very charge slanderously brought against himself and those who followed his doctrine was, that they practised and taught this impious maxim.

good may come? whose damnation is just.

<sup>1 Gr. charged.</sup> 9 What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin;

*And not rather, as we be slanderously reported.]* And why not, as is slanderously reported of us. The sentence beginning, "And why not," is interrupted by the sudden thought, "as is slanderously reported of us, and as some affirm that we say;" and the interrupted conclusion is then attached to this intervening sentence, and necessarily expressed in the Plural, "Let us do evil that good may come." The slander to which St. Paul thus alludes, was evidently directed against his doctrine that man is justified by faith, not by the works of the law (see vi. 1, and 15 ff.). But the refutation of the slander here is only incidental; the main purpose of the passage (vv. 5-8) is to cut off from the Jew all claim of exemption from God's judgment.

Accordingly the concluding sentence is directed, not against the slanderers just mentioned, but against those who object to being judged as sinners: "whose judgment is just." The fine irony of this summary decision, and the connexion of the passage, are rather obscured by substituting, as in A. V., "damnation" for "judgment."

#### 9-20. CONFIRMATION FROM THE JEWISH SCRIPTURES OF THE CHARGE THAT ALL ARE UNDER SIN.

9. *What then? are we better than they?*] The privileges of the Jews (vv. 1-4) might lead them to infer, as we know they did infer (see on ii. 3), that they were better than others in God's sight, and in view of His judgment. This false presumption is now brought prominently forward in order to be completely refuted. See note at end.

No, in no wise.] Οὐ πάντως has two meanings. (1) "Not altogether" (1 Cor. v. 10).

(2) "Not at all." A clear example of this latter meaning is found in the Epistle to Diognetus, c. ix.:—οὐ πάντως ἐφθόμενος τοῖς δημοργίμασιν ἡμῶν (ό Θεός).

This sense, required by the context, is forcibly expressed in the A. V.

for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles.] "For we before charged both Jews and Greeks." The charge against the Gentiles is made in c. i, and that against the Jews in c. ii. 17-24; but the latter are here put first in accordance with the Apostle's purpose, which is to show that Jews as well

10 As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one:

11 There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God.

12 They are all gone out of the

as Gentiles are all sinners before God (v. 19). Compare i. 16 and ii. 9, 10, for a like priority assigned to the Jews, and for the use of "Greeks," as equivalent to "Gentiles" in general.

*that they are all under sin.]* The expression denotes subjection to sin as a power that practically rules the life of all men, in their natural state, unrenewed by God's grace. Compare vii. 14; Gal. iii. 22.

10-20. *As it is written.]* At this point, St. Paul turns to the testimony of Scripture, as being in accordance with the charge of universal sinfulness which he has already made on other grounds.

10-12. This first quotation is from Ps. xiv. 1-3, which is almost identical with Ps. lxx. 1-3. St. Paul seems to quote from the LXX, with noteworthy variations.

*There is none righteous.]* Hebr. and LXX, "There is none that doeth good," as in v. 12 (Ps. xiv. 3). The word "righteous" gives the same sense in a form more exactly agreeing with the Apostle's general argument: "Δίκαιος aptum verbum in sermone de justitia." (Bengel.)

*no, not one.]* LXX, οὐκ ἀστυ εἴσι, which same words occur below in v. 12 (= Ps. xiv. 3). The Hebrew has corresponding words there, but none here; the addition was apparently made by St. Paul, and carried back at an early period into the LXX. See note on v. 12. The words thus added to the first sentence cited by the Apostle, serve to bring out in substantial agreement with the Psalmist, only more emphatically, the universal prevalence of sin, which admits no exception. This is more in accordance with St. Paul's manner of quotation, than to suppose that after the formula "as it is written," and before the words of Scripture, he has interposed his own summary of all that follows.

11. *There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God.]* Hebr. and LXX, Ps. xiv. 2: "The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God." In abridging the passage, St. Paul rightly expresses the negative sense which is implied in the original.

In the right reading (οἱ ἐννιῶν), observe (1) the form ἐννιῶν, usual in the LXX, in

way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one.

13 Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips:

14 Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness:

15 Their feet are swift to shed blood:

16 Destruction and misery are in their ways:

17 And the way of peace have they not known:

18 There is no fear of God before their eyes.

19 Now we know that what

the nominative singular only, for ἐννοεῖς, which occurs in Ps. xxxiii. 15; (2) the Article, “non est qui intelligat;” (3) the idea of sin as folly, in accordance with the opening thought of the Psalm, “The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God.”

12. *They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable.*] This agrees exactly with the LXX. The Hebrew word rendered “unprofitable,” means literally “corrupt,” as sour milk. See note on Ps. xiv. 3.

*there is none that doeth good, no, not one.]* Heb. “not even one;” LXX, “there is not even to one.”

Here the quotation from Ps. xiv. ends; but the other passages quoted in vv. 13–18, from various Psalms and from Isaiah, are interpolated in Ps. xiv., in some MSS. of the LXX, in the Vulgate, and thence in our Prayer Book Version. Probably the whole passage from Romans was written at first in the margin, and thence crept into the text of the Psalm. Other examples of this reflex action of quotation upon the text of the LXX. are found in Ps. xiv. 1; Isai. lii. 5, &c. See note on ii. 24.

13. *Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit.*] Taken exactly from the LXX of Ps. v. 9. As the grave that stands ready opened will presently be filled with death and corruption, so the throat (larynx) of the wicked opened for speech will be full of corrupt and deadly falsehood. Compare Jerem. v. 16: “*Their quiver is an open sepulchre.*”

*have used deceit.*] Literally, “were deceiving,” for the form ἐδιλούσαν see Winer, P. II. § xiii. 2 f. The Hebrew of Ps. v. 9, means literally “make smooth their tongue;” A.V. “flatter with their tongue,” cf. Prov. ii. 16.

*the poison of asps is under their lips.*] Ps. cxl. 3. The venom of falsehood is as deadly as adder’s poison.

14. *Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness.*] Ps. x. 7; compare Job xx. 14, 16. The poison of asps was supposed to lie in the bitter gall, and hence “bitterness” is a figure for venomous malice. “*Throat,*” “*tongue,*”

“*lips*” mark the successive stages by which speech comes forth: the “*mouth*” sums up all in one (Bengel).

15–17. Abridged from the LXX of Isai. ix. 7, 8, where see Notes.

18. From Ps. xxxvi. 1 (LXX.)

We must now ask how far these passages confirm the charge of universal sinfulness, in support of which they are alleged.

In Ps. xiv. 1–3, David declares that the Lord looking down from heaven upon “the children of men” could find none righteous; no, not one. It seems impossible to frame a more positive assertion of universal sinfulness: and if in vv. 4, 5, we find a people of God, and a “generation of the righteous,” the inconsistency between this and the former statement of the Psalmist is only apparent and external. In the deep inner sense which St. Paul gives to the passage, “the generation of the righteous” would be the first to acknowledge that they form no exception to the universal sinfulness asserted in the opening verses of the Psalm.

The quotations in vv. 13, 14, from Pss. v. 9, cxl. 3, and x. 7 refer to the Psalmist’s enemies, or to the wicked as a class, and contain no assertion of universal sinfulness.

The passage quoted in vv. 15–17, from Isaiah lix. 7, 8, is distinctly directed against the unrighteousness of Israel. The last quotation (v. 18) from Ps. xxxvi. 1, describes the state of a wicked man, without any reference to the universality of sin.

Thus the first quotation confirms in its whole extent the Apostle’s statement that Jews as well as Gentiles are all under sin, while the other passages supply particular illustrations of the general truth, and some of them are directed to the very point of the Apostle’s argument, that the Jews are not exempt from the general sinfulness.

It may possibly be objected that the charge of universal apostasy in Ps. xiv. applies only to some particular generation, and not to all time.

If the objection were valid, it would not affect St. Paul’s argument: the quotation would still prove as much as he uses it to prove, and more. For the nature of the

things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped,

and all the world may become <sup>1 Or, sub-  
ject to the  
judgment  
of God.</sup> guilty before God.

20 Therefore by the deeds of the

proof employed by the Apostle is very often misunderstood.

A demonstrative proof that every man is a sinner, is from the nature of the case impossible. St. Paul's method is this: he first brings the charge of actual sin against all, Gentiles and Jews, and appeals to notorious facts for proof of the general truth of the charge, leaving its individual application to every man's conscience (i. 18–iii. 9).

He then shows that this charge of universal sinfulness is illustrated and confirmed by various statements of the Old Testament concerning the Jews and men in general: and the passages cited would bear all that is thus laid upon them, even if they were less explicit as to universality of sin than some of them are.

One caution, though very obvious, is not unnecessary: the doctrines of universal sinfulness and of justification by faith are perfectly consistent with the existence of a true righteousness both under the Law and before the Law. We have seen above that the one strongest and most absolute assertion of universal sinfulness in Ps. xiv. 1–3 is immediately followed by the mention of a people of God (v. 4), and a generation of the righteous (v. 5). St. Paul's own disciple does not hesitate to say that Zacharias and Elizabeth were "both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless" (Luke i. 6).

Such a righteousness of "holy and humble men of heart" was the very opposite of the self-righteousness condemned by St. Paul, which relied, not on God's mercy, but on man's own works, and used the ordinances of the Law as means of merit, not of grace.

The Gospel more clearly revealed, but did not alter, the nature of faith and righteousness: it enlarged the object of faith, added new motives to obedience, and ministered in richer abundance the sanctifying graces of God's Spirit.

We should observe also that the point which the Apostle is here establishing is not the doctrine of original or birth-sin (as in v. 12), but the fact of universal sinfulness: and even those who reject the doctrine do not deny the fact.

**19, 20. An explanation of the connexion and meaning of these verses will be best introduced by a revised translation:** But we know that what things soever the law saith, it speaketh to them who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may come under God's judgment;

<sup>because by works of law shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for through law cometh knowledge of sin.</sup>

19. This verse is generally understood as an assertion that all the Old Testament Scriptures, and therefore the passages just quoted from the Psalms and Isaiah, speak to the Jew in order that his mouth, as well as every other, may be stopped by the denunciation of his sin.

But this interpretation is open to serious objections.

(1) It rests on the very doubtful assumption that St. Paul may have included the Prophets and Psalms under the name of "the Law," whereas this extension of the name is found only in two or three passages of St. John's Gospel, and is contrary to St. Paul's usage, 1 Cor. xiv. 21 being the one doubtful exception.

(2) This extended meaning of "the Law," even if it were not unusual in St. Paul's writings, would be inadmissible here, being opposed in two respects to the immediate context. (a) In v. 21 "the Law" is expressly distinguished from "the Prophets." (b) In the sentence "the Law speaks to them that are under the Law," the term must evidently have the same meaning in both places, and in the latter it clearly means the Mosaic code.

(3) The usual interpretation does not agree with the course of the argument at this point.

The passages from the Psalms and Isaiah have been brought to confirm the charge already made against Jew and Gentile, "that they are all under sin." But it was necessary to prove more than this in the case of the Jew, in order that his "mouth might be stopped" and that he might "be brought under the judgment of God:" for we have seen already that the Jews openly claimed exemption from final condemnation, even for wicked Israelites: See note on ii. 3.

The purpose therefore of v. 19 is not to show that the Scripture describes the Jew as a sinner, but that, being a sinner, he is in danger of the judgment. These three reasons, and especially the last, compel us to reject the common interpretation of this verse, and to take a different view of the connexion of the whole passage, vv. 9–20, which is as follows:

"We are not in any way claiming a superiority (or, putting forward an excuse) which may exempt the Jew from condemnation. For the charge which we before brought (cc. i. ii.), and which Scripture confirms (iii. 10–18), is that all, Jew as well as Gentile, are under sin."

"But the law, far from giving to the Jew

law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law *is* the knowledge of sin.

21 But now the righteousness of

God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets;

22 Even the righteousness of God

impunity for his sin, speaks in all that it says, especially to him as its subject, in order that he first (and so all the world), may be put to silence, and brought under God's judgment."

*it saith it speaketh.* In all that the Law "saith" (*λέγει*), i.e. in all the commandments which it contains, it *speaketh* (*λαλεῖ*) to those who are "*under the Law*," as the Dispensation in which they live.

*that every mouth may be stopped.*] Compare Job v. 16; Ps. lxiii. 10; cvii. 42. The mouth is stopped, when every excuse is taken away.

*become guilty before God.*] *Come under God's judgment*, or more exactly, "*become accountable to God*" (*ὑπόδικος τῷ Θεῷ*). The word is not used elsewhere in the N. T. or LXX, but is common in Plato and the Attic Orators: it means "liable to prosecution," and a Dative following it refers either to the violated law, or to the rightful prosecutor. God is thus represented as having a controversy against sinners (Job ix. 3; Jer. xxv. 31; Mic. vi. 1); but since He is also their Judge (v. 20), we may fairly translate the words as above, "*come under God's judgment*."

20. *Therefore.*] *Because* (*διότι*): this word introduces the reason why every mouth shall be stopped and all brought under judgment. The sense of the whole passage (9-20) is perverted by the erroneous rendering "*therefore*," which the A.V. first brought into the English Bible. The failure of the Jew to justify himself before God is here traced to a cause which is common to all, namely, the weakness of sinful man indicated in the term "flesh." This term (*πάσα ορεξ*) St. Paul substitutes for *πᾶς ἄνων*, "every man living," by which the LXX more exactly renders the Hebrew: "all flesh" conveys the idea of universal frailty and sinfulness; see Gen. vi. 12). The same passage (Ps. cxlii. 2) is quoted in the same form in Gal. ii. 16. In both instances St. Paul prefaces the quotation by the words *ἐξ ἐργῶν νόμου, by works of law*, a definition of the Psalmist's meaning both correct in itself and necessary in the application to the Apostle's argument. Observe, however, that the statement being universal and not limited to the Jews, the Apostle does not write "*the works of the law*," but "*works of law*," because he is stating a general truth which results from the nature of law, as being a thing which cannot give life and righteousness (Gal. iii. 21). See Introduction § 9. His meaning is, that no man shall obtain

justification from the source whence the Jew seeks it, namely, from the merit of works done in obedience to a law.

Thus, when the Jew is put to silence, every mouth is stopped: none can say after his condemnation, that they could attain to righteousness by their own obedience, if only they had a law to teach them what God requires. There is no contradiction between the statement in ii. 13, "*the doers of law shall be justified*;" and this passage, "*by works of law shall no flesh be justified*:" the former states the abstract principle or condition of legal justification: the latter declares that no man can fulfil that condition.

*for by the law is the knowledge of sin.*] *For through law cometh knowledge of sin.* A reason why none can be justified through law: for law has the very opposite effect; through it first comes a clear knowledge (*ἐπίγνωσις*, as in i. 28) of sin. This weighty thought is taken up again and developed in vii. 7 ff. We are there taught how the commandment draws out the sinful lust which it condemns, but cannot subdue; and how the law has done all that it can do, when the sinner is forced to exclaim, "*O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?*"

#### 21-26. THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD REVEALED.

"The opening of a brighter scene." (Bengel.) St. Paul has shown the universal need of righteousness (i. 18—iii. 20), and now turns from the negative to the positive side of the theme proposed in i. 17.

21. "*But now*," marks the contrast between the times of the old and new dispensations, as in v. 26, and xvi. 26.

"*Magnus ab integro sæclorum nascitur ordo.*"

*the righteousness of God without the law is manifested.*] *Apart from law a righteousness of God has been manifested.*

The words "*apart from law*," put in close and emphatic contrast to "*through law*" (v. 20), shew that the actual manifestation of "God's righteousness" has been quite independent of "*law*," i.e. not only the law of Moses, but the whole principle of law and legal obedience.

"*a righteousness of God.*" See note on i. 17. A more complete definition of this righteousness follows in vv. 22-26.

"*has been manifested.*" Having pre-

**which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference:**

viously been hidden in God's counsels it has now been made manifest in historical reality in the person of Jesus Christ (1 Cor. i. 30), "Who was manifested in flesh, justified in Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory" (1 Tim. iii. 16). The manifestation in fact is complete (*πεφανέρωται*); the revelation in the Gospel still goes on (*ἀποκαλύπτεται*, i. 17).

[*being witnessed by the law and the prophets.*] It was necessary that the manifestation of the righteousness of God should be absolutely independent of law; that the true mode of obtaining it, viz. by faith in Christ Jesus, might be set beyond reach of doubt. Nevertheless, "*the law*" of Moses has not been without its use negatively, in producing a knowledge of sin (v. 20), and positively, in bearing witness in common with the Prophets to the coming dispensation of righteousness. This testimony of Scripture includes all types, promises, and prophecies of Christ: for "to him bear all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins" (Acts x. 43; xxviii. 23). We have an example of the way in which St. Paul uses this testimony in c. iv.

**22. Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ.**] Read, "Even a righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ." The subject of v. 21 is repeated with a more precise definition distinct from (δέ) though not opposed to the preceding. Compare ix. 30; Phil. ii. 8; 1 Cor. ii. 6. The points more precisely defined are the means by which righteousness is attained, and its destined extent.

"**through faith in Jesus Christ.**" Justifying faith is here presented, not as a faith in God of which Christ is the author (Van Hengel, &c.), but as faith in Christ Himself; compare Mark xi. 22; Gal. ii. 16, 20; iii. 22; Eph. iii. 12; iv. 13; Phil. iii. 9. "The Person of Christ in its unity and totality ('Jesus Christ') is the proper redemptive object of faith" (Dorner, 'Person of Christ,' P. 11 ii. p. 113).

**unto all and upon all them that believe.**] Tischendorf and most modern editors read with the more ancient MSS. "unto all them that believe;" the variation does not materially affect the sense, but the emphatic repetition of "all" with different prepositions, is very characteristic of St. Paul (xi. 36; Gal. i. 1; Eph. iv. 6 (Col. i. 16)). If both are retained, "unto all" marks the destination and "upon

**23 For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;**

**24 Being justified freely by his**

*all*," or "over all," the extension which the "righteousness of God" is to have, both being limited to "them that believe."

Faith in Christ thus presented as the sole condition of righteousness is not regarded by St. Paul as a restriction of God's grace, but as the means of participation by which alone it can be thrown open to all mankind. Faith has itself a universal fitness for man: it grows out of his original relation to God, and is, under all circumstances, the rightful disposition of the creature towards his Creator. In man unfallen it was the trustful loving sense of dependence upon God's goodness: in fallen man it unites the deep feeling of unworthiness with the conviction that mercy rejoices against judgment; and thus in both states gives God the glory.

Faith therefore is not an arbitrary condition imposed upon us from without, but a law of our true nature: it exalts man to his rightful dignity by allowing the free consent of his will, and the active exercise of his faculties, and yet humbles him before God in acknowledgment of mercy undeserved. Thus faith is at once the soul's highest exercise of freedom, its lowliest "confession of sin," and the only homage it can render to God.

[*for there is no difference.*] The righteousness of God by faith is for all, "for there is no distinction" made therein, but Gentile and Jew are all included in the same method of salvation: and the reason why no distinction is made is that there is no difference in their need (v. 23).

**23. For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.**] The older English versions mark more correctly the difference of the tenses, and the meaning of *ὑπερεπιθυμητοί*: "For all have sinned, and are destitute of the glory of God" (Crammer, Geneva): "For all men sinned, and have need of the glory of God" (Wyclif). The subjective force of the Middle Voice ("to feel want") will be clearly perceived by contrasting the self-complacent question of the rich young Ruler, "*What lack I yet?*" (Matt. xix. 20, *ὑπερέπω*) with the description of the Prodigal, when "*he began to be in want*" and to feel it (Luke xv. 14, *ὑπερέπιθυμητοί*). The sinning is represented by the aorist as an historic fact, already proved: its present and continued effect is that men not only come short of (*ὑπερεπιθυμητοί*) but suffer want (*ὑπερέπιθυμητοί*) and feel themselves destitute of "*the glory of God*."

The meaning of this last expression is much disputed, but instead of discussing the various

grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus:

25 Whom God hath set forth to <sup>be</sup> a propitiation through faith in his

meanings which have been invented for it, we shall better enter into St. Paul's conception of "the glory of God," by combining the chief aspects in which he regards it.

In i. 23 "the glory of the incorruptible God" is (in the words of Hooker, 'E. P.' ii. 2, § 1) "the admirable excellence of that virtue Divine, which being made manifest causeth men and angels to extol his greatness."

This "glory of God" not only manifests, but communicates itself, being reflected in such of His creatures as are capable of knowing and loving and growing like Him. St. Paul therefore, in 1 Cor. xi. 7, calls the man "the image and glory of God," because he is capable of receiving and reflecting God's glory. Compare Irenaeus iii. 20, § 2: "The glory of man is God, and of the operation of God, and of all His wisdom and power, man is the receptacle;" and iv. 16, § 4: "man was in want of the glory of God."

See also Hooker 'E. P.' I. xi. § 2, "then are we happy, therefore, when fully we enjoy God as an object wherein the powers of our soul are satisfied even with everlasting delight: so that although we be men, yet by being unto God united, we live as it were, the life of God."

The complete manifestation of Divine perfection is "the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," or in other words, "the glory of Christ, who is the image of God" (2 Cor. iv. 4, 6).

This glory of God in Christ shining forth in the Gospel upon the believer's heart transforms him into "light in the Lord" (Eph. v. 8): and so "we all with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory" (2 Cor. iii. 18).

The transformation begins here, but man's full participation in "the glory of God" is the hope of our high calling reserved for us in heaven (c. v. 2; 1 Thess. ii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 14).

**24. Being justified freely by his grace.]** The Present Participle "being justified" is closely connected with the preceding clause, as its necessary accompaniment (*ιότεροντας—δικαιουμένοι*): they who through sin suffer loss of the glory of God can receive justification only as a free gift by his grace.

"The glory of God" thus restored in Man as His image, is rightly called "the perfection of his grace." Severianus, Cram. Cat. in loc.; *ιότεροι αὐτοῖς ἡ τῆς χάριτος τελεώσεις*. Thus instead of making v. 23 a formal parenthesis, and then resuming his subject in a new sentence, St. Paul, as his manner is (see on v. 26), glides back without any formal break

into the main course of his argument. For the meaning of "justified," see note on ii. 13: it is there used of one supposed to be actually "just" before being declared so by God, here of those who before were sinners, but now are both declared and *made righteous*. See note on ch. v. 19, and the passage quoted from Bp. Bull, 'Examen Censuræ,' § 17, in our Introduction § 9.

We learn from this verse that the justification of the believer takes place—(1) as a free gift, not as a reward or acknowledgment of a righteousness already existing in him; (2) "by his grace" there being a slight emphasis on the Pronoun, which contrasts God's grace, *i.e.* free unbought love, with man's merits or works (Eph. ii. 8); (3) "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus," this being the instrument or means on God's part, as "faith in Jesus Christ," v. 22, is on man's part.

*the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.]* "Redemption" is here explained by Origen as a "ransom" paid in Christ's blood to Satan for the release of his captives. This notion, so common until the time of Anselm, is derived from the Greek and Latin words (*ἀπολύτρωσις*, redemptio), not from the Hebrew. In the O. T. the great typical act, which fixes the idea of redemption, is the deliverance from Egypt. Jehovah is the Redeemer or Deliverer (Jehovah), who demands the release of His people: "Israel is my son, even my first-born: and I say unto thee, Let my son go, that he may serve me: and if thou refuse to let him go, behold, I will slay thy son, even thy first-born" (Ex. iv. 22, 23): "I will redeem you (*ἘΛΕΑΝΩ*) with a stretched out arm, and with great judgments" (Ex. vi. 6; xv. 13). The purpose of the redemption is the consecration of Israel to God's service: "I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God" (Ex. vi. 7). Jehovah pays no ransom to the oppressor, but from His people He requires an act of faith, in the sacrifice of the Passover, and an act of holy obedience in the consecration of the first-born (Ex. xiii. 1; xix. 4-6). These types are united and fulfilled in "Christ our Passover:" He is both "the Lamb that was slain" (Rev. v. 12; John i. 29; 1 Cor. v. 7), and "the first-born from the dead" (Cor. i. 18). Thus "The redemption" is "in Christ Jesus," not in any act or work, the effect of which might be separated from the agent, but in Himself (Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14), "in His person with which His work forms a living unity" (Olshausen, Eph. i. 7): Having lived and died and lived again for us, He is "of God made unto us

<sup>1 Or, passing over.</sup> blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are

past, through the forbearance of God;

... redemption" (1 Cor. i. 30), being in Himself the redeemer (Tit. ii. 14), the ransom (1 Tim. ii. 6), and the redeemed as "the first-born among many brethren" (viii. 29; 1 Cor. xv. 23; Rev. i. 5).

The ransom is more closely defined as "his life" or "soul" (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45), and "his blood" (1 Pet. i. 19).

As to the extent of the redemption, it is for Israel (Luke i. 68; ii. 32; xxiv. 21), for "many" (Matt. xx. 28; Mar. x. 45), for "all" (1 Tim. ii. 6), for "the purchased possession" (Eph. i. 14).

It redeems from sin and its penalties (Tit. ii. 14; Heb. ix. 15; 1 Pet. i. 18; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14), particularly from death (Rom. viii. 23; compare Heb. xi. 35), and generally from the present evil state into a state of glory and blessing (Luke xxi. 28; Eph. iv. 30).

**25, 26.** A further explanation of God's method of justification "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus."

*Whom God hath set forth.*] Two interpretations of the verb are admissible. (1) "Whom God set before His own mind," proposed to himself, and so "designed," "proposed," "ordained" (Wyclif). The Margin "fore-ordained" is less correct, precedence in time not being expressed by the *πρό*, but only implied in the idea of design or purpose; "quod nondum est, proponitur" (Origen).

This is the more ancient interpretation, being found in the Syriac ("prædestinavit," Schaaef), Origen, Chrysostom, Genadius in Ecumenius, and others.

It also agrees with the meaning of the Verb in the N. T. (Rom. i. 13; Eph. i. 9), though not with its construction, as an Infinitive usually follows.

(2) "Whom God set forth," i.e. "publicly before the eyes of all, that he who will be redeemed may draw nigh" (Pelagius). This sense is supported by classical usage (Herod. iii. 148; Eurip. 'Phœn.' 1330, *Icc.* 613), by the Vulgate, Cranmer, Geneva, A.V., and the majority of modern interpreters.

In the LXX the Verb occurs thrice in the Middle Voice, but in a sense slightly differing from either of the above: Ps. liv. 3; ("they have not set God before them,") Pss. lxxxvi. 14, and ci. 3.

The meaning "Whom God set forth" is best suited to the idea, made so prominent in this passage, of a public exhibition: and the Middle Voice indicates that God himself was interested in thus setting forth His own Son as a propitiation to show forth His righteousness. With either meaning, the Father is the author of our redemption.

*to be a propitiation.] as a Propitiatory, i.e. a mercy seat.* For a full discussion of the Greek word *ἱλαστήριον*, see Note at end of chapter.

Amid all the variety of rendering the essential meaning of the word remains sure; it represents Christ as making *propitiation* for sinners, and so obtaining mercy and forgiveness for them.

Moreover, the all-important truth that the efficacy of Christ's propitiation lies "in His blood," i.e. in His dying as a sacrifice for sin, shines out too clear in the context to be obscured by any possible rendering of the word *ἱλαστήριον*.

*through faith in His blood.]* The clause "through faith," omitted in A, and not interpreted by Chrysostom, is authenticated by the consent of all other MSS., Fathers, and Versions, and confirmed by the recurrence of *ἐκ πίστεως* at the close of v. 26. The absence of the Greek Article does not affect the English translation, nor the connexion of the clause with the context.

The following considerations might be thought to favour the connexion given in the A. V.

(a) That the construction "faith in His blood" is grammatically correct, is clear from Eph. i. 15, *τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς πίστιν εὐ τῷ Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦν*: where the absence of a second article after *πίστιν* shows that it is structurally connected and fused into one idea with *ἐν τῷ Κ.* I., the substantive *πίστις* taking the same construction as the Verb, *πιστεύειν εἰς* (Meyer, Fritzsche). Compare LXX Ps. lxxviii. 22, *οὐκ επιπέρευαν εὐ τῷ Οὐρώπῃ*; Jer. xii. 6, *μὴ πιστεύονται εὐ αὐτοῖς*: Mark i. 15.

(b) The objection that no other example is found in Scripture of such an expression as "belief in the blood of Christ," is set aside by the equally unexampled expressions "justified in his blood" (v. 9), and "made nigh in the blood of Christ" (Eph. ii. 13).

(c) That the expression is not inappropriate is thus proved by Bp. O'Brien, 'Nature of Faith,' Note P. p. 383.

"If we are told that the *Blood* of Christ was shed for the remission of our sins (Mark xiv. 24); that we are justified by (in) His *Blood* (Rom. v. 9); that we have redemption through His *Blood* (Eph. i. 7); that He made peace through the *Blood* of His Cross (Col. i. 20); that those who were afar off were made nigh by (in) "His *Blood*" (Eph. ii. 13); that He purchased the Church of God with His own *Blood* (Acts xx. 28); that He has washed us from our sins in His own *Blood* (Rev. i. 5), that through His *Blood* we have

26 To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be

just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.

boldness to enter into the Holiest (Heb. x. 19); if all this . . . is declared concerning the efficacy of His *Blood*, it can hardly be thought strange that it should be anywhere stated that His *Blood* is the object of the *faith* of His people."

But still, though the expression "*faith in his blood*" (Post-Communion Prayer) is in itself unobjectionable, the context of the present passage requires that the element in which lies the inherent power of Christ's Atonement, viz., His blood, should not be introduced as a subordinate point, merely to define more closely the subjective condition, man's faith, but should hold a more prominent and independent position in the sentence (Meyer, Philippi, &c.).

This argument is much strengthened by the emphatic position of *autōs*, rightly explained by the Greek Fathers. "The Propitiatory of old was itself bloodless, since it was also without life, but it received the sprinkling of the blood of the sacrifices: but the Lord Christ and God is at once Propitiatory, High Priest, and Lamb, and in His own blood (*οἰκεῖῳ αἷματι*) negotiated our salvation, requiring only faith from us" (Theodoret). The two clauses "*through faith*" and "*in His own blood*," are therefore parallel, and both depend on *ἱλαστήρου*: render, therefore, "Whom God set forth as a Propitiatory through faith in His own blood." Compare Heb. ix. 12, 25.

*to declare his righteousness.*] "for an exhibition of his righteousness." This direct purpose (*eis*), and chief final cause for which God set forth Christ, is afterwards more fully explained in the words *eis τὸ εἴναι ἀντὸν δίκαιον*, κ.τ.λ.

The connexion of the whole passage (vv. 21-26) makes it clear that *His righteousness* here is the same "*righteousness of God*" which is spoken of in vv. 21, 22. There the Apostle defines its relation to the Law, and the means and extent of its appropriation by man; here he points to an exhibition of the same righteousness as it exists under a twofold aspect in God its author and source: He is Himself just, and justifies the believer in Jesus. His is at once a sin-condemning and sin-forgiving righteousness.

The various interpretations "truthfulness," "goodness," "holiness," "judicial righteousness," "punitive righteousness," &c., all fail to satisfy the context, because they substitute an arbitrary and limited idea of righteousness for that "*righteousness of God*," which it is the very purpose of the passage to exhibit in all the fulness of its manifestation.

*for the remission of sins that are past.]* "because of the passing over of the sins that had gone before." See Deleititzsch, Heb. ix. 15.

In thus distinguishing, with the Margin, between *πάρεστις* "prætermission," "passing by," and *ἀφέσις* "remission," i.e., full release and dismissal of sins, we are treading on the ashes of a fierce but extinct controversy concerning the remission of sins under the Mosaic dispensation, of which a brief notice may be found in Trench, 'Synonyms of N. T.', 1<sup>st</sup> series, p. 133.

We must also observe that the word here used for sins, *ἀμαρτήματα*, is comparatively rare (Mark iii. 28; iv. 12; 1 Cor. vi. 18) and denotes the sinful deeds done, not the essential sin *ἀμαρτία*, of which they are the out-comings. It is joined with *παρένειαι* in Josephus, 'Antt.' xv. 3, 2, and in Xenophon, 'Hipparch.' vii. 10, "It is not right to let offences pass by unpunished."

"When the son of Sirach (Eccl. xxiii. 2) prays to God that He would not 'pass by' his sins,—he assuredly does not use *οὐ μὴ παρῇ* as = *οὐ μὴ αἴθῃ*, but only asks that he may not be left without a wholesome chastisement following close on his transgressions." (Trench, l. c.)

The contrast between "*this present time*" and the "*sins that had gone before*" shows that the foregone sins of which St. Paul here speaks are not those of individuals before conversion, but "*the sins of the world before Christ*" (Meyer), including "the transgressions that were under the first testament," i. e. the sins of the Jews (Heb. ix. 15).

Those foregone sins God had let pass for the time without adequate expiation or punishment. His wrath which had been revealed from heaven against all ungodliness (i. 18) was not a complete vindication of His holiness, for though the sins against which it was denounced were increased and aggravated (i. 24-32), yet He did not suffer His whole displeasure to arise, but, with rare exceptions, His justice seemed to slumber.

*through the forbearance]* in the forbearance. This overlooking of sins has its cause "in the forbearance of God," an expression which clearly distinguishes it from the remission of sins, which is the effect of His grace and favour.

"Forbearance" (ii. 4) is a temporary suspension of anger, "a truce with the sinner, which by no means implies that the wrath will not be executed at the last; nay, involves that it certainly will, unless he be

27 Where is boasting then? It works? Nay: but by the law of is excluded. By what law? of faith.

found under new conditions" (Trench, 2nd Series, p. 15).

One effect of God's forbearance is to obscure for the time His righteousness: "*These things hast thou done, and I kept silence; thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself*" (Ps. l. 21; compare Eccl. viii. 11-13). Thus in the impunity of sin during the times of ignorance that God winked at (Acts xvii. 30), there arose a secondary cause, for an exhibition of His righteousness, (*διὰ τὴν πάρεστιν, κ.τ.λ.*) a cause having reference only to His mode of dealing with the sins of the generations which lived before Christ. But the primary cause of that exhibition of His righteousness was not the need of a "Divine Théodicée of the past history of mankind" (Tholuck), but the forgiveness of the sins of all ages, even unto the end of the world.

26. *To declare, I say, his righteousness,*] "in view of the exhibition of his righteousness." The A. V. treats this as a mere resumption of *εἰς ἐνδείξιν κ. τ. λ.* in v. 25, in which case the change of expression (*πρὸς τὴν ἐνδείξιν*) becomes, as Meyer confesses, unmeaning.

But connect the clause with that which immediately precedes, and all is clear: God set forth Christ for an exhibition of His righteousness—because He had let the sins of former generations pass for the time unpunished in view of the exhibition of his righteousness at this present time—that he might be just, &c. The passage thus construed, is a striking example of a well-known peculiarity in St. Paul's style, of which an exactly parallel case is found in Eph. iii. 3, 4, 5: he "goes off at a word" (*μυωτήριον*), in order to connect with it some accessory thought, which he follows out until it brings him back to the same word again (*ἐν τῷ μυωτήριῳ τοῦ χριστοῦ*), and then glides back into the main line of the sentence without any parenthesis or other formal interruption of the grammatical construction (See above on v. 24.)

Here he goes off at the word *ἐνδείξιν* in order to bring in a subordinate reason for such an "exhibition" which might otherwise have been overlooked (*διὰ τὴν πάρεστιν κ. τ. λ.*), and with this thought, and by means of it, works round to the same word again (*πρὸς τὴν ἐνδείξιν*). The Article is required by the renewed mention of *ἐνδείξις*, which is the same exhibition as before, but in accordance with the mention of the sins of former times is now more nearly defined as "the exhibition in this present time," even this addition of *ἐν τῷ νῦν κατρῷ* being

an exact parallel to the addition *τοῦ Χριστοῦ* in Eph. iii. 4.

"The time of Christ is a time of critical decision, when the *πάρεστις* is at an end, and man must either accept the full remission (*ἀφεσίς*) of sin, or expose himself to the judgment of a righteous God" (Schaff).

The clause "in this present time" points to the contrast of former ages. "*The righteousness of God*" then partially obscured, has been clearly manifested and exhibited "in this present time," i. e. the time subsequent to Christ's death.

*that be might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.] That be might himself be just, &c.* There are some remarkable illustrations of this antithetical expression in some of the Rabbinical comments on Isaï. liii. 11:

"His (Messiah's) true perfection will consist, first of all, in his perfecting himself as far as possible in the service, the fear, and the love of God, and afterwards in conferring the same perfection upon others, as is done by the Almighty himself."

"Moses, more than any one else, helped to make others perfect, according to the saying, *Moses was just and justified many.*"

"Moses was worthy himself, and made many others worthy as well" (Neubauer, 'The Jewish Interpreters of Isaï. liii. pp. 325, 339, 287).

The exhibition of the righteousness of God had a double purpose: Christ was therein set forth (1) as "*propitiatory in his blood*" to show that God is Himself "just," i.e., to vindicate His righteousness against the seeming impunity of sins in former ages, and (2) as "*propitiatory through faith*," to show that God is the author of righteousness to them that believe. "The righteousness of God is shown especially in this, that He so utterly hates sin, that in order to destroy it, and make man righteous, He sent His own Son into the world, and gave Him up to death" (Estius).

Calvin's interpretation, though not strictly derived from the context, like that which has been given above, is not inconsistent with it, and is worth quoting briefly: "This is a definition of that righteousness which was exhibited in the gift of Christ, and revealed in the Gospel (i. 17). It consists of two parts: (1) God is righteous, not as one among many, but as containing in Himself alone all fulness of righteousness: God alone is righteous, and all mankind unrighteous. But (2) God's righteousness is communicative: He pours it forth on man. In us,

**28** Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.

**29** *Is he* the God of the Jews only? *is he* not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also:

therefore, the righteousness of God is reflected, inasmuch as He justifies us by faith in Christ."

*him which believeth in Jesus.]* Literally—"him that is of faith in Jesus," i.e., him that has faith in Jesus as the root of his relation to God, in opposition to them that are of the law or of works: see note on ii. 7.

#### 27-31. RESULTS OF GOD'S METHOD OF JUSTIFICATION.

Looking back on his whole previous argument from i. 18, and more especially on the representation in iii. 21–26, of "the righteousness of God by faith," St. Paul now proceeds to draw out some of its grand results: (1) that it gives glory, not to man, but to God only (*vv. 27, 28*); (2) that it includes Jew and Gentile in one universal method of Salvation (*29, 30*); (3) that it establishes Divine law on its true basis (*31*).

*Where is boasting then? "Where then is the boasting?"* It is true that all human glorying is equally excluded, but the question has special reference (as the Article shows) to the boasting before mentioned (ii. 17, 23), namely that of the Jew, which he has been combating throughout the whole section (ii. 17—iii. 20). It is this sense of conflict brought to a victorious end, that gives so triumphant a tone to the Apostle's question, the tone of a conqueror looking round for an adversary who has already disappeared (*i Cor. i. 20; xv. 55*).

*It is excluded.]* Though there can never really be room for any boasting on man's part before God, yet boasting will intrude; nor can it be shut out "by the law of works," which rather tends to foster self-righteousness. But "a law of faith," a dispensation which says, not "This do, and thou shalt live," but "Believe, and thou shalt be saved," at once shuts out all boasting: for to believe is to trust not in ourselves, but in God, to feel ourselves helpless, to confess ourselves unworthy, and to cast ourselves with full confidence upon God's mercy in Christ.

*By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith.]* Read—"By what manner of law? (By the law) of works? Nay; but by a law of faith."

St. Paul's exact and significant use of the Article is disregarded in the A. V., and misinterpreted by Lange: "Since the Mosaic law was a law of works in form only, and not in spirit (see vii. 7), the question presupposes that there is no such law of works:

the spirit of the law is the law of faith." This refined distinction between the form and spirit of the law of Moses is out of place. The article before *ἐργασίαν* shows that the clause must be completed thus—*ὅτι τοῦ νόμου τῶν ἐργασίων*; Instead of presupposing that there is no such law of works, the question in fact presupposes that "the (definite) law of works" is well-known. Accordingly "a law of faith" does not mean the law of Moses recognised in its spirit as being a law of faith (Lange): but the Gospel is called "**a law of faith**," because, like the Mosaic law, it declares the *will of God*, only what it demands is *faith*, for "*this is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom he hath sent*" (Joh. vi. 29; compare i Joh. iii. 23).

**28. Therefore we conclude.]** **For we deem** (Wyclif). The reading *γάπα*, now confirmed by the Sinaitic Codex, is necessary to the sense. What the context requires is a confirmation of the statement in *v. 27*, that boasting is excluded by a law of *faith*. That confirmation St. Paul brings from the general principle already established by the whole previous discussion that "*man is justified by faith apart from works of law*": compare the words "*apart from law*," in *v. 21*. That "*man is justified by faith*," proves that faith is necessary to the Jew: that man is justified without or apart from "*works of law*," proves that "*the works of the law*" are not required of the Gentile. Thus the boasting of the Jew is wholly excluded: for not only is the law (in which he had made his boast) insufficient without faith, but faith is sufficient without the law: compare note on *v. 30*, and Gal. ii. 14–16.

On the word "*man*," Chrysostom's comment is excellent. "He says not 'Jew,' nor 'he that is under the law'; but having enlarged the area of his argument, and opened the doors of salvation to the world, he says '*man*', using the name common to the nature."

**29. Is he the God of the Jews only?** The exact rendering would be "Or is God of Jews only?" but in an English Version it is better to repeat the word "God:" "**Or is God (a God) of Jews only? Not of Gentiles also? Yes, of Gentiles also.**" A question which confirms the statement of *v. 28*, by alleging as the necessary alternative what is manifestly impossible. Compare on this use of *ἢ*, notes on vi. 3; vii. 1; ix. 21; xi. 2.

Man must be justified by faith without

30 Seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith.

works of law, or else the justification which God has provided depends on a condition, which none can fulfil but they which are under the law. God would thus shew that He cared for none but Jews, and belonged to them only.

30. *Seeing it is one God.*] “**If so be that God is one.**” The proof that God is God of Gentiles as well as of Jews, lies in the first fundamental article of the Jews’ religion, that Jehovah is God alone, even the God of all the kingdoms of the earth. See 2 Ki. xix. 15; Isaiah xliv. 6; Deut. vi. 4; 1 Cor. viii. 4–6; 1 Tim. ii. 4–6. The difference between ἐπεινέπ (“seeing that”) and εἰπερ (“if so be that”) affects the rhetorical form only, and not the logical cogency of the argument.

With εἰπερ St. Paul does not himself assert the absolute certainty of the statement “**God is one,**” but knowing it to be in fact as absolutely certain for his readers as for himself, puts it before them to decide. Compare 2 Thess. i. 6.

*which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith.*] “Who will justify circumcision, &c. The truth that “**God is one,**” having been alleged to prove that He is God of Gentiles as well as of Jews, St. Paul now appends to it, as a corollary, the unity of His plan of justification for all. This is the connexion: “Yes, of Gentiles also, since God is one; and so His plan of justification by faith will include both Jew and Gentile.”

“It is not to be supposed,” says Origen, “that St. Paul has varied his use of prepositions at random.” His use of the article is equally free from caprice, and when we fail to discern the meaning of some nice distinction in the Apostle’s choice of words, it is more reasonable to impute the want of discrimination to ourselves than to him.

The usual distinction between ἐξ and διά is, that ἐξ indicates the origin, source, or root, i.e. the primary cause: διά, the intervening, instrumental, and so the subsidiary cause, means, or condition.

Here, accordingly, ἐκ πίστεως is used of the Jew, to indicate that whatever may be his present condition and privilege, the real source and root of justification (so far as it depends on himself) must be faith. And faith being something new which the Jew has not yet got, πίστις is used without the article.

In regard to the Gentile, the point in dispute was not whether his justification had its origin in faith, but whether his faith in

31 Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law.

Christ was sufficient to justify him without circumcision and the law. The two opposite views of this question might be thus expressed:

(1) δικαιοῦται ἐκ πίστεως διὰ νόμου καὶ περιτομῆς.

(2) δικαιοῦται ἐκ πίστεως καὶ διὰ τῆς πίστεως χωρὶς νόμου.

The second view, which is St. Paul’s, means that in the justification of the Gentile, the faith which he already has, supplies the place of all subsidiary means, such as circumcision and the law. Compare note on v. 28.

31. *Do we then make void the law through faith?*] “Law” (without the article), means neither the O. T. Scriptures (see on v. 19), which St. Paul does not assume to establish by his doctrine, but conversely, his doctrine by the Scriptures; nor “the law of Moses,” as the basis of the Jewish Dispensation, nor any particular law, but that which is common to all law, its essential character and principle. Compare Delitzsch on Hebr. viii. 6 and note N.

In this sense St. Paul has said that “**the righteousness of God has been manifested apart from law**” (v. 21), and that “**man is justified by faith apart from works of law**” (v. 28). To the Jew who knew no “law” but “the law” of Moses, and valued that as the method of attaining to righteousness, such statements must seem to abolish the whole principle of law, and make it void.

St. Paul in his usual manner anticipates the objection, by putting to himself the question which might be urged against him: “**Do we then make law of none effect through faith?**” i.e. through “**the faith**” which we have mentioned above as the sole condition of justification.

For the sense of καταργοῦσσεν, see iii. 3; iv. 14. St. Paul did undoubtedly make of none effect the Jewish idea of “**the law**,” as the means of attaining to righteousness, and as necessary for the Gentile (compare Gal. ii. 16–19); but he shrinks from the thought (μὴ γένοντα, see iii. 4, 6) of making “**law**” in its true character of none effect.

*For, we establish the law]* “**Nay, we establish law;**” we set it up, and make it stand firm by putting it upon its proper base. Viewed as a revelation of the eternal principles of morality, or in other words, of the holy will of God, “**law**,” so far from being made void, is for the first time fully vindicated, and established by the Gospel of “righteousness by faith.”

The two sides, negative and positive, of the Apostle's answer are developed in his subsequent argument. As to the former, he proceeds at once to show in c. iv., that law is not made void by its exclusion from justi-

fication, for this had always been so; it had no place in Abraham's justification by faith.

The positive side, the establishment and vindication of law in its true character, is discussed at large in c. vii.

### ADDITIONAL NOTES on vv. 9, 25.

**9. I.** Τί οὖν; προεχόμεθα; οὐ πάντως προητικάμεθα γάρ. This is the received text, supported by a great preponderance of the best authorities, and accepted by all modern critics. Its interpretation depends upon the meaning of προεχόμεθα.

(a) *προεχόμεθα*, Passive.

This explanation is given by a Scholiast (possibly Photius) in Ecumenius. The assertion of the great advantage of the Jew, leads the Gentile to exclaim, "What then? Are we fore stalled, and surpassed?" *ἥμεις προελήφθημεν, προεχόμεθα;* To which St. Paul replies, "No, in no wise. If they have not done right, they are responsible just as you are, if you have not done right. But if both do right, the salvation is equal, so that you are not surpassed (*προέχεσθε*).

This sense of *προέχεσθαι* is found in Plutarch. But the decisive objection to this, and all other explanations which ascribe the question to a Gentile, is that there is nothing in the context to justify the transition to a Gentile speaker. (Fritzsche, Meyer.)

(b) *προεχόμεθα*, Middle.

(i) "Do we (I, Paul, and other Jews) put forward anything as a defence or excuse?"

There is force in Philippi's objection that the Verb in this sense must have its object expressed—*προεχόμεθά τι*; Herodot. II. 42, *προεχεσθαί τε τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποταμόντα τοὺς κριῶν*, is no exception: but Meyer disregards this objection, and with Fritzsche, Ewald, Th. Schott, Morison, adopts the explanation, which agrees well with the context, and preserves the usual meaning of *προέχεσθαι*.

(2) "Do we put ourselves forward?" i.e., as better than those over whom God's judgment impends (Hofmann), or, as better than the Gentiles.

Objection. No example has been found of *προέχεσθαι* in this sense.

(3) "Are we better than they?"

This is the interpretation adopted in the English Versions from Wiclif to A. V., and is the simplest and best. It is supported by the Vulgate: "Quid ergo? Præcellimus eos?" and by Euthymius (about A.D. 1100), quoted by Reiche in his "Critical Comment."—

\*Ἄρα περὶ στὸν ἔχομεν παρὰ τοὺς Ἑλληνας;

In this case the Middle Voice has its subjective force: "Are we in our own opinion better? Do we think ourselves better?"

II. Τί οὖν προεχόμεθα; οὐ πάντως.

The received text, with this punctuation throwing the two questions into one, is thus explained in Ecumenius: "What advantage, then, have we (Jews), and what did we gain by being preferred before the uncircumcised?" But in this case the answer must have been in a different form, answering to *τι*; e.g. οὐδέν τοι οὐ πάντως.

III. Τί οὖν προκατέχομεν περισσόν; προητικάμεθα, κ.τ.λ.

This reading, in which *οὐ πάντως* is wholly omitted, is capable of two interpretations:

(i.) "What advantage, then, do we (Jews) retain?"

So the Syriac (Schaaf), "Quid ergo obtinetus excellentia?" evidently referring to v. 1: "What advantage, then, hath the Jew?" and agreeing in the general sense with I. b. 3.

(ii.) "What advantage do we (Christians) hold?"

This explanation is adopted apparently by Origen, Chrysostom, and Theodoret: by Theodorus in Cramer's Catena ("After the reproof of our kinsmen, i.e. the Jews, we will speak of the greatness of our advantages,") and still more explicitly by Severianus [or Severus of Antioch (*Reiche*)], in Ecumenius and in Cramer's Cat. τι ἔχομεν ἡμεῖς ἐκ τῆς χάριτος περισσόν καὶ ἔκαρπόν; περὶ ποτίστην τὴν δάλα Ἰησοῦν Χριστοῦ δικαιουντης οὐδαν ἀπεργαστικήν.

But the reading, though found in D G can only be regarded as an ancient gloss, adopted into the text on account of the ambiguity and difficulty of the received reading.

25. *A propitiation*: not the Abstract Noun *ἱλασμός* (1 John ii. 2; iv. 10), but *ἱλαστήριον*, "propitiatory," originally a neuter adjective, but constantly used in Biblical Greek as a substantive in the definite concrete sense "place or instrument of propitiation;" compare ἀκροατήριον, δικαιτήριον, θυματήριον, θυσιαστήριον. Once in N. T. (Heb. ix. 5), and about twenty-five times in LXX, it means the lid of gold above the Ark, called *πλέξ* "mercy-seat," or "propitiatory." It first occurs in Ex. xxv. 17, καὶ ποιήσῃς *ἱλαστήριον* ἐπίθεμα χρυσόν καθαρόν, "and thou shalt make a propitiatory, a lid of pure gold," the

construction being the same as in Ex. xxvi. 1, 7. This apposition of ἀλατήριον and ἐπίθεμα is the more natural, because on this first occurrence of ἡράβε the translators might wish to show that they had both meanings under their consideration.

In Ezek. xliii. 14, 17, 20, τὸ ἀλατήριον is used by the LXX for the ledge or raised base of the altar, "the settle" (A. V.), which like the capporeth was to be sprinkled with the blood; and in Amos ix. 1, for ἡράβε, "the lintel," mistaken apparently for ἡράβε. Philo ('Vita Mos.', Lib. III., c. viii., ἐπίθεμα τὸ προσαγορεύμενον ἀλατήριον) recognises ἀλατήριον as the technical and constant name of the lid of the Ark.

Upon this Biblical usage is founded the ancient interpretation.

*Origen* says that the Apostle here "refers the propitiatory described in Exodus to none but the Lord our Saviour." So on the Gospel of St. John, tom. I, c. 38, he says that "the golden propitiatory resting on the two Cherubim in the Holy of Holies was a sort of shadow of this propitiatory." He also quotes Lev. iv. 16, καὶ εἰσοισετε ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ χριστὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ μόσχου κ.τ.λ.

*Corysostom* (who is misunderstood by Meyer) gives the same interpretation. After showing that "his own blood" stands in contrast to the legal sacrifices, he explains ἀπολύτωσις, and then goes on: "And for this very reason he calls Him ἀλατήριον, showing that if the type had so much power, much more will the reality exhibit the same."

*Theodoret.* See the striking passage quoted in the footnote on the words "through faith in his blood."

*Cyril*, in Cramer's Catena: "For He has been set as a propitiatory through faith in His blood; for since He has made His own blood an exchange for the life of all, He has saved the world, and made the God and Father in heaven propitious and favourable to us."

*Theophylact*, and Gennadius in Ecumenius, give the same interpretation.

The *Syriac* has the same word here, and in Ex. xxv. 17, a word, however, which it uses also in the sense of "atonement."

The *Latin* varies between "propitiatorium," "propitiatorem," and "propitiationem."

*Luther* gives "Gnaden-Stuhl," and *Tyndale*, "a seat of mercy."

This interpretation has been supported with abundant learning, by a host of commentators.

The following objections are urged against it by Meyer and others.

(1) The Article would be required.

This is a mistake, τὸ ἀλατήριον would designate (as in Heb. ix. 5) the well-known propitiatory itself, rather than an antitype or realized idea of it, now mentioned for the first time.

(2) This name in its application to Christ would come in here quite abruptly, without anything in the context to prepare for it.

If this objection were valid against the most familiar sense of ἀλατήριον, it would apply with still greater force to all the other less usual meanings which have been ascribed to the word.

But in fact the mention of "redemption," in v. 24, has introduced the general idea of atonement, and the reference in v. 21 to the testimony of the law, prepares the way for an allusion to its typical atonements, of which the very centre and core was "the mercy seat," by it the law gave its most solemn and significant testimony to that righteousness of God which was not yet made manifest. See Heb. ix. 1-10.

(3) The objection that προέθετο, "set forth," would be inappropriate because the Ark of the Covenant, in the Holy of Holies, was hidden from the people, is not merely refuted by Heb. ix. 8-10, but the public setting forth of the Antitype becomes, in the light of that passage, an argument in favour of an allusion to the hidden Type.

(4) "If Christ were really thought of as Caporeth, the following εἰς ἔνδεξιν τῆς δικαιουσίνης αὐτοῦ would be inappropriate, since the capporeth must have appeared rather as the ἔνδεξις of the Divine grace. Compare Heb. iv. 16."

This objection has no other foundation than the narrow and erroneous interpretation of "the righteousness of God," as if it were limited in this passage to "the judicial, more precisely the *punitive justice*, which must find its holy satisfaction, and received that satisfaction in the propitiatory offering of Christ." (Meyer.) But "the righteousness of God," rightly understood, is in fact one with His mercy.

(5) The conception of Christ as the antitype of the mercy seat, is found nowhere else in the whole N. T.

This is true; but it does not therefore follow that this conception is foreign to the Apostle's mode of viewing the atoning work of Christ. There are other examples of O. T. ideas and figures applied once and once only to Christ, as "the Rock" (1 Cor. x. 4), "the Serpent" (John iii. 14); and conversely we find a N. T. idea applied once only to O. T. history in 1 Cor. x. 2, "baptized unto Moses." (Compare the Additional Note on ix. 5, Obj. (1).)

II. There is no proof that the word was

ever used by any writer *as a Substantive*, for “a propitiatory offering,” or “a propitiation,” or in any other than the well-established Biblical sense. The passages alleged in favour of “a propitiatory sacrifice,” prove only that the Adjective was joined with such Substantives as θίάστης, μνήμα, αἰώνιμα: see 4 Macc. xvii. 22; Joseph. Antiq. xvi. c. 7; Dio Chrys. Orat. xi. 1.

The analogy of τὸ σωτήριον (more frequently, ἡ θεοία τὸν σωτῆριον), “the peace-offering,” is in favour of the sense supported by Biblical usage, not of that for which no usage can be found.

Moreover, if ἀλατήριον meant a sacrifice, the emphatic αὐτοῦ (“in his own blood”) would be unmeaning; it is needless to say that a sacrifice is propitiatory in its *own* blood. See footnote on the words “through faith in his blood.”

III. The abstract idea of “propitiation” is inappropriate after προεθέτω, which points to a definite public appearance. (Meyer.)

IV. “Propitiator,” found in some Latin Codd. (Origen), is adopted by Aquinas, Melanchthon, Estius, Van Hengel, and rendered by Wiclit “forgiver,” by Cranmer, “obtainer of mercy.”

V. Morison takes the word as simply an Adjective, “propitiatory,” in which case also it must be masculine.

This view, therefore, as well as IV., is open to Meyer’s objection, that there is no example of ἀλατήριος used with reference to persons.

If it be urged that the simple adjective is the more comprehensive rendering, embracing all that is essential in the rest, and designating Christ as the antitype of *all* symbols of propitiation (Schaaf on Morison), we must still maintain that there is a special

and predominant allusion to the mercy seat, not to the sacrifice.

On the whole we conclude that the rendering “**a propitiatory**,” meaning “a mercy seat,” is required by the following considerations: (1) the absence of any other adequate explanation of the emphatic position of αὐτοῦ in ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἴματι: see note on those words; (2) the well-known Biblical sense of ἀλατήριον; (3) the consent of the Greek Fathers, including Chrysostom; (4) the propriety of the idea “in accordance with which Christ the bearer of the Divine glory and grace, sprinkled with His own sacrificial blood, would be regarded as the antitype of the Kapporeth.” (Meyer.)

The force of this last argument is much enhanced when we remember the twofold significance of “the propitiatory.”

(1) It was the central point of the Divine Presence and Manifestation, the place of meeting and communion, between God and the representative of His people; Ex. xxv. 22; Lev. xvi. 2. So in Christ the full manifestation of God to man is made, and on Him rests “the glory of the Lord,” the true Shekinah, now revealed by the rendering of the vail.

(2) Among all instruments and symbols of atonement, this alone was called “the propitiatory” as being the most eminent. As on it was made a general atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year (Lev. xvi. 11-14, 15, 30); so in Christ Jehovah expiates and takes away the sins of the world, thereby declaring Himself the Holy One, who will have His people also to be holy (compare Bähr, ‘Symbolik des Mos. Cultus,’ I. 387 ff. and Kurtz, ‘Sacrificial Worship of the O. T.’ p. 42).

## CHAPTER IV.

**I** Abraham’s faith was imputed to him for righteousness, 10 before he was circumcised. 13 By faith only he and his seed received the promise. 16 Abraham is the father of all

that believe. 24 Our faith also shall be imputed to us for righteousness.

**W**HAT shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found ?

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH INDEPENDENT OF WORKS, OF CIRCUMCISION, AND OF THE LAW.

In iii. 27-31, St. Paul has rapidly strung together some of the consequences that follow from the great doctrine set forth in vv. 21-26, especially those consequences which directly affect the position of Jew and Gentile under the new law of faith. These

summary statements of the closing verses of c. iii., are taken up again and fully discussed in subsequent parts of the Epistle.

The first point is the exclusion of the glorying of the Jew (iii. 27, 28), and the second, closely connected with it, is the equality in God’s sight of Jew and Gentile, circumcision and uncircumcision (vv. 29, 30). These two points in like order and connexion form the subject of c. iv.

**2** For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God.

**3** For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness.

**I.—8. JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH WITHOUT WORKS FORESHOWN IN THE EXAMPLE OF ABRAHAM, AND IN THE WORDS OF DAVID.**

**1.** *What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found?* [The phrase "What then shall we say," &c. introduces an inference from the preceding passage (iii. 27–31), not from its last words especially: compare vi. 1; vii. 7; viii. 31; ix. 14, 30 (Van Hengel). If glorying is excluded, and there is no distinction between Jew and Gentile, what then shall we say of the case of Abraham?

The record of Abraham's faith in Gen. xv. 6, supplies an instance of righteousness "apart from law" and yet "witnessed by the Law" (iii. 21). In reasoning with Jews concerning the "righteousness of faith," St. Paul could not possibly pass over the example of Abraham's justification (Gen. xv. 6), which was a standard theme of discussion in the Jewish schools. Bp. Lightfoot ('Galatians,' p. 154), in an interesting Essay on "The faith of Abraham," quotes, among other striking passages collected by Größer, one from the *Mekilta* on Ex. xiv. 31:—"Abraham our father inherited this world and the world to come solely by the merit of faith, whereby he believed in the Lord; for it is said, *And he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness.*"

On the opinion that St. James (ii. 14–26), refers to St. Paul's doctrine, or to some prevalent perversion of it, see the Introduction to St. James in this Commentary, and Theile, 'Comment. in Ep. Jacobi,' pp. 145–166.

*as pertaining to the flesh.] According to the flesh.* St. Paul puts the question as proceeding from a Jew, and Abraham is therefore called "our father," or, as in many authorities, "our forefather." "He calls him a father according to the flesh, ejecting them (the Jews) from true kinship with him, and preparing the way for the kinship of the Gentiles" (Chrysostom): "For by faith and by promise we that believe are Abraham's children" (Photius).

Theodoret adopts the other reading—"What shall we say that Abraham our father hath found according to the flesh?" and thus interprets it: "What righteousness of Abraham's, wrought by works before he believed God, did we ever hear of?" For the righteousness that is in works, he calls "according to the flesh."

Bp. Bull, adopting this connexion, explains κατὰ σάρκα as meaning "by his natural powers without the grace of God;" so Grotius and Hammond. Pelagius, Estius, and others have referred it to circumcision, as received by Abraham first: but circumcision is not treated of until v. 9.

The preponderance of authority is in favour of that order of the Greek words which compels us to adopt the connexion: "What then shall we say that Abraham our forefather according to the flesh hath found?"

The general question "What then is the advantage of the Jew?" (iii. 1) is thus made to depend for decision on the case of the great Patriarch, from whom all blessing and privilege was derived: "What advantage has he gained for himself and for us his descendants?"

On the reading see note at end of chapter.

**2.** This argument (as well as the question in v. 1, which it is meant to support,) is put from the Jewish point of view, as an objection to the statements in iii. 27–30, which seem to deny all advantage to the Jew, and to be inconsistent with the received tenet that Abraham was justified by works (1 Macc. ii. 51, 52; Sirach xlv. 20; Ja. ii. 20).

"Glorying, you say, is excluded. What then shall we say of Abraham? For if, as we Jews hold, Abraham was justified by works, he hath whereof to glory."

In the latter part of the verse—Αλλ' οὐ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν—St. Paul from his own point of view more closely defines the ambiguous term "glorying," and at the same time directly denies the conclusion: "But Abraham has not whereof to glory before God." This denial of the conclusion, being proved from Scripture, in vv. 3–5, shows that the antecedent supposition also is false, and that Abraham was not justified before God by works: a result which is further confirmed in vv. 6–8, by its accordance with the testimony of David.

The question of v. 1, "What then shall we say that Abraham our forefather according to the flesh hath found?" is thus in part answered: he has found, not any cause of glorying in his own merits, but "the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works."

The question, what has Abraham found, receives a further answer in the discussion concerning circumcision, which follows in vv. 9–12.

4 Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt.

5 But to him that worketh not,

but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.

6 Even as David also describeth

Among the advantages of this interpretation, are the following :

(1) It makes the Apostle's argument perfectly clear and simple.

(2) It does not depend on the particular sense assigned to *kara σάρκα*, a phrase on which other interpretations put a strained dogmatic import, which finds no support in the context.

(3) It avoids the great faults of the Patriotic interpretation, which assigns to "justified" and "glorying" meanings quite inconsistent with St. Paul's usage; see Bp. Bull, in Note at end of chapter.

3. Proof from Scripture that Abraham has not anything whereof to boast before God. The emphasis of the quotation lies on the word "*believed*," which is brought into the first place in the sentence, and "rendered almost antithetical by a trifling change of δέ for καί" (Winer): faith, not works, was counted unto Abraham for righteousness, because when old and childless he believed God's promise that his seed should be as the stars in multitude: see note on Gen. xv. 6. The import of the promise, and the nature of Abraham's faith are explained by St. Paul, in vv. 17-22.

*it was counted unto him.]* In vv. 3-11, the A.V. employs three different words "count," "reckon," "impute," to render the same Greek word λογίζομαι, and thus obscures the clearness and force of the argument.

"*Impute*" agrees closely with the Hebrew צוֹרֵן, which in Kal means not "to number," but "to think, regard, or consider." Compare Gen. xxxviii. 15; 1 Sam. i. 13 ("and Eli took her for a drunken woman"); 2 Sam. xix. 19; Ps. xxxii. 2. But as "*impute*" has become a technical term in Theology, associated with a particular theory of Justification, it is better to use the word "count" throughout the passage.

*for righteousness.]* Abraham's faith was counted to him as righteousness, not merely as leading to righteousness; he was both regarded and treated as being righteous, and that because faith in God is in reality man's only true righteousness. See note on iii. 22.

4, 5. Explanation of the language used concerning Abraham in Gen. xv. 6, showing that it involves the principle of justification by faith without works.

*Now to him that worketh.]* In this illustration, taken from common life, the

words have their ordinary meaning. Such interpretations as, "worketh righteousness" (Theodoret) "worketh that which is good" (Fritzsche), are out of place; and even Luther's "dealeth in works," belongs to the application rather than to the illustration itself. There is nothing to be supplied, but the Verb ἐπάγεσθαι is used absolutely of "working for hire," as in Acts xviii. 3; 1 Cor. ix. 6; 2 Thess. iii. 12. This meaning, adopted by Origen, is put beyond doubt by the following words, "*bis reward*" (ό μυθός), i.e. "the hire" corresponding to his work.

*is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt.]* St. Paul assumes that the language of Gen. xv. 6 implies a *gratuitous* imputation, and on that assumption argues that Abraham's justification was not like the case of one who works for his reward, and has it counted to him as strictly due.

But where is this idea of *gratuitous* imputation to be found (1) in the word ἀλογίζθη itself; (2) in εἰς δικαιοσύνην; (3) or in ἐπιστένετε?

Against (1) it is enough to observe that λογίζομαι is used indifferently of "setting to a man's account" what is or is not his due; e.g. the imputation of sin (v. 8) as well as of righteousness.

The true explanation lies in (2) and (3) combined, i.e. in the fact that *faith*, which was counted for righteousness, involves in its very essence the renunciation of all merit. It could therefore be counted for righteousness only by an act of God's free grace.

5. *But to him that worketh not.]* St. Paul here begins as if he meant to give an illustration parallel and opposite to that contained in v. 4: "to him that worketh not whatever is reckoned, must be reckoned not of debt but of grace." But in the clause "but believeth," &c., the general principle runs into the application, and is expressed in terms appropriate to the case of justification.

*but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly.]* The strong term τὸν ἀσεβῆ "the ungodly man," has been thought to refer to Abraham as having been formerly an idolater. (Döllinger, 'First Age of The Church,' i. 273, note.)

But the Singular, τὸν ἀσεβῆ, has the ordinary generic sense, describing not the individual Abraham, but the class to which Abraham and all who are justified by faith belong.

the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works,

7 *Saying, Blessed are they whose*

iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered.

8 *Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin.*

The word *ἀρεβής*, which does not occur in the Gospels or the Acts, is frequent in the LXX, and is not limited to its strict etymological sense, “one who does not worship the true God,” but is also used in the general sense, “irreligious, ungodly, wicked,” being quite as common as *ἄδικος* or *ἄνο�ς*, and far more common than *ἀμαρτωλός*.

The force of the word is admirably explained by Beveridge, Sermon xc., as describing “whatever is offensive to God’s person, contrary to His nature, injurious to His name, or unbecoming His honour and majesty in the world.”

See Suicer’s Thesaurus, and Origen on v. 6 in Cramer.

The strong word is chosen, as in v. 6, to heighten the contrast between the unworthiness of man, and the mercy of God in justifying him. Compare the Epistle to Diognetus, c. ix. “For what else could cover our sins but His righteousness? In whom was it possible for us, the wicked and ungodly (*τούς ἀνάρους καὶ ἀρεβές*), to be justified, except only in the Son of God?”

“With the growth in goodness grows the sense of sin. One law fulfilled shows a thousand neglected. Moral advancement, as a natural consequence, destroys the sense of merit, and produces that of sin.” (Moztley, ‘Essays,’ i. 326).

*his faith is counted for righteousness.]* We see here the nature of the faith that is counted for righteousness; it is the faith of one who regards himself as “ungodly,” and unable to justify himself by his own works, but on the other hand has full trust in God’s mercy to justify him, unworthy as he is.

This is the quality of true faith on its human or subjective side. “The believer has nothing more to expect than what God bestows on the ungodly whom He justifies; and nothing more to offer to God than what the ungodly who longs to be justified has to bring with him, namely, faith.” (Hofmann.)

6-8. The language of Scripture concerning Abraham’s justification as above interpreted (vv. 3-5), corresponds with that of the 32nd Psalm, in which David also pronounces the blessing of the man to whom God imputeth righteousness without works. This then is not a second example from the O. T. of God’s method of justification, but a statement confirming the Apostle’s interpretation of the case of Abraham, which he resumes in v. 9.

*describeth the blessedness.]* “*telleth the blessing.*” The *πακαρπίους* (v. 9 and Gal. iv. 15) means not “blessedness,” but “a declaring blessed,” “a felicitation;” it is the proper word to apply to God, and to the most God-like among men, and to all that is highest, happiest, and best (see Aristote, ‘Nic Eth., I., xii. 4; ‘Rhet.’ I., ix. 34).

*imputeth righteousness.]* When God counts a man’s faith to him for righteousness, this is more briefly expressed by saying that God counts righteousness to him, that He counts him righteous, or, in one word, justifies him. The doctrine of “imputed righteousness,” founded partly upon this passage, assumes sometimes such strange forms that it will be useful to quote here the words of one of its most learned and moderate advocates. “Finding it distinctly stated not only that sinners are justified by *faith*, but that *righteousness without works is imputed to them, their faith being counted for righteousness*, I have not hesitated to state that believers are justified by *imputed*, not by *inherent*, righteousness. That this is Christ’s righteousness in the sense that it is the fruit and purchase of His work in the flesh, cannot be doubted; but that it is His in the more strict and exact sense, in which, as the Archbishop (Tillotson) truly says, it appears in the statements of some supporters of the doctrine, I have nowhere asserted, but have been and am still content with the sober statement of Hooker, (‘Discourse of Justification,’ § 6.) “Christ hath merited righteousness for as many as are found in Him” (Bp. O’Brien, ‘Nature of Faith,’ p. 352, note N.).

*without works.]* As the blessedness of which David speaks rests solely on the fact that *sin* is forgiven, covered, not imputed, there is no room to think of *works* in such a case. This non-imputation of sin, St. Paul calls an imputation of righteousness (v. 6), and uses this negative aspect of justification as showing most clearly that it is altogether independent of works, and so confirming his argument concerning the justification of Abraham.

7, 8. *Saying, Blessed are they.]* The Greek, as well as the Hebrew, may be better rendered here, and in v. 8, as an exclamation: “**Happy they,**” &c., “**Happy the man,**” &c. For the general meaning of these verses, see notes on Ps. xxxii. 1, 2.

9 Cometh this blessedness then upon the circumcision *only*, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness.

10 How was it then reckoned? when he was in circumcision, or in

uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision.

11 And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe,

#### 9-12. THE MEANING AND USE OF CIRCUMCISION.

9, 10. The question “What has Abraham, our forefather, found?” (v. 1), concerns Abraham’s children as well as himself; and the partial answer, that he has found a blessing such as David his descendant describes, gives occasion for the further question whether this blessing is limited to those who are of the circumcision, as Abraham and David both were. Thus after having shown that Abraham’s justification was by faith and not by works, St. Paul proceeds further to prove that it was not dependent on circumcision.

*Cometh this blessedness then upon the circumcision only, or upon the uncircumcision also? Is then this blessing upon the circumcision, or, &c.*

The word “*only*” is not in the Greek, and the sense is sufficiently clear without it.

The word “*then*” shows that the question arises out of the preceding argument, and is to be answered in accordance with it: this is further shown in the words that follow, “*for we say*.”

The reasoning will be made clearer by dropping the interrogative form. Abraham, we say, became partaker of the blessing when he was justified by faith: he was so justified while yet in uncircumcision: therefore we conclude that the blessing is not upon the circumcision only, but upon the uncircumcision also. The conclusion, though drawn from the one case of Abraham, is assumed to be general, and rightly so, because that case is not merely an example or “fair specimen” of the rest, but the origin and cause of all, as is more fully shown in v. 11. Thus the nature and conditions of circumcision in all cases depend upon its nature and condition in the case of Abraham, and the argument is one from cause to effect. The repeated interrogations and dilemmas of vv. 9, 10, add much to the rhetorical force and grace of the passage, but the cogency of the reasoning is not dependent on them.

11. This verse is closely connected with the preceding, and completes the description of the relation between Abraham’s justifica-

tion and his circumcision, which took place about fourteen years afterwards.

*the sign of circumcision.]* In instituting circumcision (Gen. xvii. 11), God says “*It shall be for a token (LXX., σημεῖον) of the covenant betwixt Me and you.*” Former covenants had in like manner been confirmed by visible signs, the rainbow (Gen. ix. 12, 13, 17) and the burning lamp (Gen. xv. 17, 18).

*a seal of the righteousness of the faith, &c.]* In v. 17, St. Paul expressly quotes the chief promise of the covenant of circumcision, “*I have made thee a father of many nations*,” and in v. 18 declares it to be “*according to that which was spoken, So shall thy seed be*,” i.e., according to the very promise concerning which it had been said, “*Abraham believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness*” (Gen. xv. 5, 6). In other words, the new covenant, repeating and enlarging the promise which Abraham had believed, was an assurance to him that his faith had been approved; and “*the sign of circumcision*,” which “*he received*” with it, and which the Rabbis called “*the Seal of Abraham*,” was “*a seal of the righteousness*” imputed to him because “*of the faith which he had being yet uncircumcised:*” compare v. 12. This metaphorical sense of the word “Seal,” meaning any strong external confirmation (1 Cor. ix. 2), arises out of the use of a seal to authenticate and confirm a written covenant.

*yet being uncircumcised]* Literally in his uncircumcision.

*that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised.]* Literally “*while in uncircumcision*.” Both the construction and the sense of the passage are illustrated by an early quotation of it in the Epistle of Barnabas, c. xiii.: “Behold, I have made thee father of the nations who believe in the Lord without having been circumcised ( $\delta\acute{\iota}$  ἀκροβυτίας).” For this use of  $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$  compare ii. 27; xiv. 20; 2 Cor. ii. 4.

The blessing promised to Abraham included from the first “all families of the earth” (Gen. xii. 2, 3), and the same universality is seen in each renewed promise, that his seed shall be as the dust of the earth (Gen. xiii. 16), and as the stars of heaven (xv.

though they be not circumcised ; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also :

5). Abraham's faith in the promise was seen in his conduct on each occasion, and on the last it was expressly recorded and "counted to him for righteousness." He was thus accepted as righteous through faith, not only for himself, but as the father of the promised seed, that they also might be justified through faith: and so far as his fatherhood conveys the Divine blessing, it is a fatherhood according to promise, and according to faith, not according to the flesh: compare Gal. iii. 7.

This is made yet clearer by what follows in Gen. xvi.: Abraham, already pronounced righteous, and selected to be the father of the promised seed, seeks to obtain it "according to the flesh;" but Ishmael, so begotten, is not the heir of the blessing, not being the child of faith, nor of promise.

Then in Gen. xvii., thirteen years afterwards comes the solemn renewal of the covenant, prefaced by the condition "Walk before me, and be thou perfect," inaugurated by the new names El-shaddai, Abraham, Sarah (see notes on Gen. xvii.), and finally sealed by the sign of circumcision.

In the renewed promises the universality of the blessing, and its religious or spiritual character are strongly marked: v. 4, 5, "thou shalt be a father of many nations, lit. 'of a multitude of Goyim:' v. 6, "I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee:" v. 7, "I will establish my covenant . . . for an everlasting covenant to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee."

In striking contrast to this universal participation in the blessing is the limitation of the ordinance of circumcision, which is not extended beyond the family of Abraham (see Michaelis in note on Gen. xvii. 13). It thus marked and sealed the *human source* of the promised blessing, namely Abraham's "body now dead," and the *human channel*, namely Abraham's bodily descendants.

The Jews overlooked the all-important distinction between the universal inheritance of the blessing, and the particular instrument chosen for its actual realisation: they did not understand that it was to be realised *through* them but *for* all,—through one channel chosen, set apart, and *sealed* by circumcision, but *for* all who should be fitted in the same way as Abraham was to receive the blessing, i.e., for all who like him should believe God's promise of salvation, and walk before Him in uprightness.

Thus by circumcision Abraham was marked out as the divinely appointed father of the promised seed in every sense; (1) of the seed

12 And the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the

in whom all nations should be blessed, i.e. Christ; (2) of the seed that should be the human channel of the blessing, i.e., the Jews, and; (3) of the seed that should be as the stars of heaven, the multitude of nations that should be counted as Abraham's children, being heirs of the same blessing through the like faith, i.e. "of all them that believe."

St. Paul here treats of the fatherhood of Abraham in the two latter senses, i.e., in reference to Gentiles and Jews. Circumcision, as a seal of the righteousness of faith in the uncircumcised, was not given for his sake alone, but that by transmitting the assurance of the like blessing to others "he might be father of all them that believe, while in uncircumcision, in order that righteousness may be imputed to them."

With this connexion the parallel clauses, "father of all them that believe," and "father of circumcision," have their due prominence, which is rather obscured, if the clause "in order that righteousness," &c., is made parallel instead of subordinate to "that he might be father," &c.

12. *And the father of circumcision.*] The second purpose for which Abraham had "received the sign of circumcision" was, that he might transmit it, with its assurance of blessing, to his seed after him; in other words, "that he might be father of circumcision." But to whom? To those who received it as he received it, namely, "as a seal of the righteousness of faith;" to those, therefore, who have not only the outward sign in the flesh, but also the inward quality of which it is the seal, i.e. in St. Paul's own words, "to them who are not of circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham which he had, while in uncircumcision." This verse evidently refers to Jews only, but St. Paul, or rather his amanuensis Tertius, who wrote this epistle, or one of its earliest transcribers, has inserted a superfluous Article —ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχοῦσιν, the effect of which would be to extend to *all* that walk in the steps of Abraham's faith, a statement which applies only to those who inherit from him the rite of circumcision. There is no trace of a various reading, and no ingenuity can explain the Article, without introducing a confusion of thought wholly foreign to St. Paul. It is in fact a strong testimony to the usual precision of his reasoning and language, that so many elaborate discussions have been raised over a mere slip of the pen, or clerical error.

steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which *he had* being yet uncircumcised.

13 For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, *was* not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the

law, but through the righteousness of faith.

14 For if they which are of the law *be* heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect :

*being yet uncircumcised.]* Literally, while in uncircumcision. Why does St. Paul so emphatically repeat, what might here seem unnecessary, that Abraham's faith was a faith which he had while yet in uncircumcision? Because the very point of his argument is this, that in the example of Abraham we see the justification, not of a circumcised, but of an uncircumcised believer. "It is not for believing Gentiles to enter by the gate of the Jews, but for the Jews to enter by the gate of the Gentiles" (Godet). Compare note on v. 16

### 13-17. THE PROMISE INDEPENDENT OF LAW.

13. It has been shewn that Abraham's justification, and that of his children, with the blessings resulting from it, were dependent, not on circumcision, but only on faith (vv. 11, 12). This is now confirmed, and extended by shewing that the promise was equally independent of the law.

13. *For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law.]* For not through law is the promise to Abraham or to his seed. The argument closely resembles, but is not identical with, that in Gal. iii. 18. There "law" (without the Article) is represented as a principle directly opposed to "promise," so that "the inheritance" cannot be dependent on law, because God has granted it to Abraham by promise.

Here "law" and "righteousness of faith" (both without the article) are the principles opposed to and excluding each other; and what St. Paul asserts in v. 13, and proves in the following verses, is that "the promise" of the inheritance was to be realised and appropriated "not through law (14, 15) but through righteousness of faith" (16, 17).

*that he should be the heir of the world.]* What is "the promise" meant? For there is none in Genesis expressed in these words. Many commentators, with Meyer, refer it to the promise of the land of Canaan, interpreted as a type of the universal dominion of the Messianic theocracy, invested by the Prophets with a halo of glory, adopted in allegoric form by Christ Himself (Matt. v. 5; xix. 28), and shared by St. Paul (viii. 17;

i Cor. vi. 2). The context forbids this interpretation, having no reference to the promise of the land of Canaan, but to "the seed" in whom all nations of the earth were to be blessed. The subject of the whole chapter is Abraham's justification by faith in the promise (Gen. xv. 5, 6): "*so shall thy seed be.*" To that passage St. Paul recurs, again and again (see vv. 3-5, 9-12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20-22). It is inconceivable that in this v. 13, "*the promise . . . through the righteousness of faith,*" should mean not the promise which Abraham believed, and for believing was accounted righteous, but another subordinate promise, to which the context makes no allusion. St. Paul does allude several times in this chapter (vv. 17, 18) to another passage of Genesis (xvii. 5), in order to show the relation of faith to circumcision; and he regards that passage, not as containing a different promise, but as ratifying and defining the same promise of the seed (see especially v. 18). That one promise, rightly understood, included all the rest; for, "*in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed;*" this was "*the blessing of Abraham*" (Gal. iii. 14), which was to come upon the Gentiles in Christ Jesus, and this, because it included all other blessings, was the inheritance of the world, the same inheritance of which St. Paul has spoken in Gal. iii. 18, 29: compare i Cor. iii. 22, 23; Heb. i. 2. "The promise will be literally fulfilled when the kingdoms of the world are given to the people of the Most High, and Christ will rule with His saints for ever and ever (Dan. vii. 27, &c.)." (Schaff.)

*but through the righteousness of faith.]* The righteousness of faith is not the procuring cause which moved God to grant the promise (as Meyer strangely asserts), but the conditional cause by which the promise was to be appropriated, and its fulfilment secured. "Faith" had been called forth from the first announcement of the promise (Gen. xii. 1-3), but the expression "*righteousness of faith,*" points to the renewal of the promise in Gen. xv. 5, 6.

14, 15. Proof that the promise is not to be realised through law.

14. *For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void.]* For the phrase

15 Because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, there is no transgression.

16 Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the

promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all,

οἱ ἐκ νόμου, "they which are of law," see notes on ii. 8, and iii. 26. The argument rests on the assumption that "law" and "faith" are opposite principles which exclude each other; for, as Chrysostom says, "he that clings to the law as saving him, dishonours the power of faith." If, then, they which depend on law, and not on faith, are heirs of the promised blessing, then faith—ἡ πίστις, the faith of which we have been talking—"is (hath been) made void," it has had no room to operate, and no influence on the result, but has been emptied of its supposed power.

*and the promise made of none effect.]* Compare Gal. iii. 17, εἰς τὸ καταργήσαντὸν ἐνυγγέλιαν.

15. *Because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, there is no transgression.]* Read, **For** the law worketh wrath, **but** where no law is, there is no transgression. The assertion made in Gal. iii. 18, that "If the inheritance be of (the) law, it is no more of promise," is here more fully explained from the nature and effect of law. By making known the existence of sin, and exhibiting it in the form of actual transgression, the law brings man under God's wrath and condemnation, so producing an effect the very opposite of that which is intended by the promise (see iii. 20, and Gal. iii. 10, 11).

With the second γάρ retained, as in the A.V. the proof that "the law worketh wrath" is compressed into one brief but striking sentence: "For where no law is, there is no transgression." To complete the proof, we must add, "and where there is no transgression, there is no wrath;" and then, farther, assume that the negative propositions involve the truth of their positive counterparts: "Where law is, there is transgression; and where transgression is, there is wrath." For a full exposition of the relation between law and sin, see vii. 7 fl.; and for the distinction between sin and transgression, which is sin against a known law, see v. 13, 14.

But with the various reading δέ (B, C, &c.), now generally received instead of γάρ, the construction is much simpler. Instead of an incomplete proof that "the law worketh wrath," we have the truth that "the promise is not of law," proved, both positively and

negatively, from the effects produced where there is, and where there is not, law; the negative statement serves at the same time to explain and confirm the positive, by showing how law worketh wrath, i. e. through transgression.

The article is prefixed to νόμος in the beginning of the verse, because it has been mentioned just before in v. 14. It is dropped again in the clause "where no law is," which is perfectly general, referring to all law, and not only to "the law."

16,17. *Therefore it is of faith.]* The question discussed by St. Paul is the simple alternative whether the promise is of law or of faith (v. 13): having proved in vv. 14, 15 that it cannot be of law, he at once concludes, "**For this cause it is of faith:**" compare Gal. iii. 12.

*that it might be by grace.]* This is the Divine purpose underlying the fact that "it is of faith." Promise, faith, and grace stand together on one side: law, works, and merit on the other. Compare vv. 4, 5 and Gal. iii. 18, "For if the inheritance be of (the) law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it (κεχάρισται, "hath granted it of grace") to Abraham by promise."

St. Paul's rapid sentences—"For this cause of faith, that by way of grace"—may be completed either by supplying from v. 13 "the promise is," or from v. 14, "the inheritance is" (Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva). This reference to v. 14 is more probable because of the significant contrast ἐκ νόμου, ἐκ πίστεως (vv. 14, 16).

*to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed.]* Here, as in v. 11, St. Paul sees one purpose underlying another in the deep counsels of God: the inheritance is "of faith" in order that it may be given by way of grace, and of grace that it may be secured to all. "He here states a double boon, that the gifts are 'sure,' and that they are sure 'to all the seed'" (Chrysostom).

*not to that only which is of the law.]* If the promise could have been secured by the law to *any seed*, it must have been "to that only which is of the law," i. e., to Jews who live under the law of Moses. But in fact the promise if dependent on law could not be sure to any, since none could earn it by keeping the law: thus even to Jews it can be sure only as of grace and therefore of faith; and

<sup>a</sup> Gen. xv. 5.

<sup>b</sup> Or, like <sup>c</sup> Gen. xv. 5.  
unto him.

17 (As it is written, <sup>a</sup>I have made thee a father of many nations,) before him whom he believed, even God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were.

18 Who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the

father of many nations, according to that which was spoken, <sup>b</sup>So shall thy seed be.

19 And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about an hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sarah's womb :

again we may say : The Jew must enter by the same gate as the Gentile. See note on last clause of v. 12. The same condition, then, which alone makes the promise sure even to those children of Abraham who are of the law, namely the condition of faith, makes it “sure to all the seed, not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham.”

It is self-evident that in this connexion “all the seed” means “all the believing seed,” and “that which is of the law” means only the believing Jews : compare v. 12, and Gal. iii. 7-9.

[*who is the father of us all.*] The spiritual fatherhood of Abraham already asserted in vv. 11, 12 is now proved by the solemn sanction of a Divine utterance: “for a father of many nations have I made thee” (Gen. xvii. 5, taken exactly from the LXX). The parenthesis only repeats the previous statement in the words of Scripture, and so does not obscure the connexion: “Who is the father of us all . . . before him whom he believed, even God.”

The Present Tense carries us back to the scene of Gen. xv. where Abraham, standing before God (*κατέστη*, compare Ex. xxxii. 11) whose promise he has believed, is already in His sight the father of a seed countless as the stars: for God's purpose knows no hindrance; though Abraham is as one dead in regard to the natural power of begetting children, God is he “that giveth life to the dead” (compare Deut. xxxii. 39; 1 Sam. ii. 6): and though Abraham has as yet no seed, God is he that “ calleth the things that be not as things that be.” This phrase does not exactly mean “calls into being,” nor “names as being,” but “calls to, summons, commands the things that be not as being,” i. e., as if they were as much present and obedient to His word as things that be: a conception of almighty power more sublime, if possible, than the creative fiat, “Let there be light,” or the Psalmist's thought “He calleth the number of the stars: he calleth them all by their names.”

The glorious attributes thus implied in God's promise, were realised in Abraham's faith, and formed its strong foundation.

#### 18-22. THE STRENGTH OF ABRAHAM'S FAITH.

[*18. Who against hope believed in hope.*] “Who against hope in hope believed.” This striking oxymoron, or combination of opposite qualities, is well explained by the older commentators: “past hope of man, in hope of God” (Chrysostom): “past hope according to nature, but in hope of the promise of God” (Theodoret): “past hope of his own nature, in hope of the power of Him that promised” (Severianus). Meyer's analysis of Abraham's faith as “opposed to hope in its objective reference, and yet based on hope in its subjective reference,” shuts out the actual objective reference to God's power.

[*that he might become the father of many nations.*] “To the end that,” &c., as in v. 16. This was not only the divinely appointed end of Abraham's faith, but also what Abraham himself looked to as the end of his faith. He believed with the full intention of becoming, what God promised, “the father of many nations.”

[*19-21. And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead.*] This passage, according to the Received Text, refers to the narrative in Gen. xv. 1-6. On that occasion Abram took no heed at all to the difficulties attending the promise; he did not fix his mind upon the fact that his own body was already deadened, he being about a hundred years old, and upon the deadness of Sarah's womb: but at once, as the immediate sequence in the narrative implies, he embraced and believed the promise. This view of the passage as referring to Gen. xv. 1-6 seems at first sight to be confirmed by v. 22: but see note there.

Modern critics, supported by strong evidence of MSS, Versions, and Fathers, omit the negative in *οὐ κατένοσεν*, and refer the passage to Gen. xvii. 17 ff., from which some of its language is plainly borrowed. With this reading v. 19 must be closely connected with v. 20, the sense being that Abraham did notice the difficulties, but yet doubted not God's promise, i. e., the new promise concerning Sarah in Gen. xvii. 16, 21. Translate:

**20** He staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God;

**21** And being fully persuaded that, what he had promised, he was able also to perform.

**22** And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness.

**"And without growing weak in faith, he observed his own body deadened, being about a hundred years old, and the deadness of Sarah's womb; but at the promise of God he staggered not through unbelief, but waxed strong in faith, giving glory to God, and being fully persuaded that what he hath (A.V. had) promised, he is (A.V. was) able also to perform."** "Staggered," a strong and picturesque word substituted by Tyndale for Wiclif's more exact and simple "doubted" (xiv. 23; Matt. xxi. 21, &c.). The Geneva Version reads "disputed," an admissible sense (Acts xi. 2; Jude 9), but less suitable.

**20. giving glory to God.]** *I.e.*, by acknowledging His almighty power; this meaning is made clear by the explanation added in the following clause, "*and being fully persuaded,*" &c. These two participial clauses describe the mental effects which attended the strengthening of Abraham's faith. But we may add that Abraham gave glory to God in act as well as in thought, by his prompt obedience (Gen. xvii. 22, 23).

**22. And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness.]** "**Wherefore also it was imputed,**" &c.

"**Wherefore**" refers to the preceding context, *vv. 18–21*, and means "because he thus held fast his faith and gave glory to God." St. Paul extends the declaration of Gen. xv. 6 to the later occasion (Gen. xvii.), when the triumph of Abraham's faith was even more conspicuous. In like manner the same passage is applied in 1 Macc. ii. 52 to the offering of Isaac: "*Was not Abraham found faithful in temptation, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness?*" Compare Ja. ii. 23.

### 23–25. ABRAHAM OUR PATTERN.

The leading example of justification by faith having been fully discussed in regard to Abraham himself (*vv. 3–22*), St. Paul proceeds to apply its teaching to his readers.

**23. Now it was not written for his sake alone.]** Compare Philo 'On Abraham,' c. i.:

**23 Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him;**

**24 But for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead;**

**25 Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.**

"Men whose virtues are recorded, as on pillars, in the sacred scriptures, not only to the praise of the men themselves, but also for the sake of encouraging those who read their history and leading them on to emulate their conduct."

**24. But for us also.]** "**But for our sake also,**" *i.e.*, not only for our instruction and exhortation, xv. 4 and 1 Cor. ix. 10, but to assure us that righteousness shall be imputed to us in like manner: for "What is written of Abraham is written of his children": Beresch. R. (Tholuck).

*to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe.]* Read "*to whom it shall be imputed, namely to us who believe.*" The last words define the class to which we must belong, if that which is recorded of Abraham is to be fulfilled also in us. The word μέλλει is not a mere equivalent for the future "it will be imputed," but (as in viii. 13) implies the certainty of a Divine appointment, "it is to be imputed," and that not in the future judgment, but as soon as we believe.

*that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.]* "**that raised Jesus,**" &c. The faith which is to be imputed to us for righteousness is thus defined by the specific character of God, in whom we trust: as Abraham believed a Divine promise, which only the life-giving and creative power of God could perform (*v. 17*), so Christians trust for redemption and justification to Him who has already raised Jesus from the dead for this very purpose.

**25. The reason why faith in Him who raised up Jesus from the dead, is to be imputed to us for righteousness lies in the purpose of Christ's death and resurrection.** The Apostle thus returns to the main point of his subject (iii. 24) "bringing in the Cross into the midst" (Chrys.).

*Who was delivered for our offences.]* *I.e.* "**delivered up,**" to death, as in the leading passage, Is. liii. 12: ἀνθ' ὁν παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ, . . . καὶ διὰ τὸν ἀνομίαν αὐτῶν παρεδόθη.

The Passive Verbs indicate that Christ was given up to death, and raised again by the Father: compare viii. 32.

"*For our offences*," i.e., to atone for them: "*for our justification*" to accomplish it, i.e. in order that we, like Abraham, might be justified through faith in God that quickeneth the dead; compare v. 17 with v. 24. The former clause, if it stood alone, might fairly be interpreted, "because of the offences which we have committed." But the more comprehensive sense, including the fact of offences committed, is that given by Theodore: "On account of our offences He endured the Passion, in order that He might pay our debt." This also agrees better with the parallel clause, "rose again for our justification," in which the same Preposition (*διά*) is used.

Though the Atonement for sins was made

by Christ's death, it was proved and manifested by His resurrection, and so presented as an object of faith. The resurrection, therefore, serves this purpose, that we may thereby be led to believe that Christ died for our sins, and by so believing may realise and appropriate the benefits of His death; in other words, that we may be justified.

More than this, the Resurrection is itself the source of Justification and life (v. 18; vi. 5, 6; Eph. ii. 5; Col. ii. 13). "On the Cross, our Lord gave Himself for us; through the Resurrection, He giveth Himself to us. On the Cross, He was the Lamb which was slain for the sins of the world; in the Resurrection, that Body which was slain became Life-giving." (Pusey, 'Christ Risen our Justification,' a noble Sermon on this text.)

#### ADDITIONAL NOTES on Chap. IV., vv. 1, 2, 25.

1. (1) Modern Editors read with a great preponderance and variety of authority, *εύρηκέναι ΑΒ. τὸν προπάτορα ἡμῶν κατὰ σάρκα*.

(2) Omit *εύρηκέναι* B, 47\*: Chrysostom does not comment on it.

(3) Place *εύρηκέναι* immediately before *κατὰ σάρκα*: K L P, 47 mg. Syr., many Fathers.

(4) For the unusual word *προπάτορα* many MSS and Fathers read *πατέρα*.

Dr. Westcott (*Dict. of Bible*, ii. p. 530) regards *εύρηκέναι* as possibly an interpolation: but it is supported by overwhelming authority, and the sense is so clear without it, that a copyist would be more likely to omit than to insert it. The wish to secure its connexion with *κατὰ σάρκα* accounts for the change of place.

2. The argument of this passage is fully discussed by Bishop Bull, 'Harmonia Apostolica, Dissertatio Posterior,' c. xii. 14-27, whose criticism may be abridged as follows.

A. Interpretation of the Greek Fathers—Major: *If Abraham was justified by works, he has not anything to glory of before God* (since this sort of external righteousness, however glorious in the eyes of men, is of no value in the sight of God).

Minor: *But Abraham had wherewithal to glory before God* (i.e. he was approved by God Himself).

Conclusion: *Therefore Abraham was not justified by works.*

The conclusion is in accordance with St. Paul's meaning, but the premisses do not agree with the text.

(a) If any one should say that v. 2 belongs wholly to the major premiss (i.e., as the

Greek Fathers above), he would verily make the Apostle's argument marvellously elliptical, as consisting of one proposition only, without either minor premiss or conclusion expressed.

(b) Moreover, St. Paul manifestly speaks of the same glorying which in iii. 27, he had declared to be excluded by the law of faith; and which, therefore, he could not attribute to Abraham, whom he everywhere maintains to be justified by that law of faith.

It is true that there is, as Grotius says, a just and proper sort of glorying, even before God (v. 2, 3, 11; 1 Cor. i. 31; 2 Cor. x. 17), but it is equally certain that in treating, as here, of the matter of justification, it is the Apostle's habit to exclude all glorying entirely.

(c) Further, according to this interpretation, the Apostle would contradict himself in terms: for he would be supposed to argue thus:

If Abraham was justified by works before God, then he deserved praise only of men, and received no praise nor reward from God. Is not this the same as if the Apostle had said, if Abraham was justified by works, he was not justified?

(d) If it be said, that "justified" here means "regarded as righteous by men," this is opposed to the whole context, in which it is too clear to need proof that the question discussed is concerning man's justification in the sight of God Himself.

Moreover in this way also, there will be a senseless tautology in the Apostle's words.

If by works Abraham was justified before men, then he was justified before men, not before God.

What can be more absurd than such reasoning?"

B. The interpretation of Bishop Bull himself, Fritzsche, and others is as follows:

What then shall we say that our fore-father Abraham has gained according to the flesh, i.e., by his own natural powers without the grace of God?

He has gained nothing in this way. For let us suppose the contrary, that he obtained justification according to the flesh, that is, by works done in his own strength.

*If Abraham was justified by works, he has something to boast of before God*, namely the works by which he was justified. *But the consequent is proved false by Holy Scripture (vv. 3-5), and he has not anything to boast of before God.*

Therefore the antecedent must be false, and Abraham was not justified by works, and has gained nothing according to the flesh.

25. Dean Alford here attributes to St. Paul an "alliterative use of the same Preposition, where the meanings are clearly different," and remarks on v. 24, "Observe that διά in the two clauses has not exactly the same sense,—'on his account' being—(1) to celebrate his bis; and (2) on our account =for our profit: see on v. 25."

Godet also insists that διά has its only proper and natural sense in the first clause, "because of the offences which we have committed," and that the second clause must therefore be rendered, "because of our justification which was accomplished by his death." The same view of the passage was taken by Grotius, Bp. Horsley, and Dr. Burton in his note on Bp. Bull, 'Harmonia Apost.', p. 12.

The whole difficulty arises from attributing different senses to διά. This radical error is carried to an extreme by Cornelius a Lapide, who gives no less than five senses to the Preposition in the last clause, saying that it signifies the material cause, the exemplary, the efficient, the meritorious, and the final cause.

The fact is, that διά with the Accusative ("through to") simply traces an effect to a cause, it marks the *existence* of a causal relation between them, without defining its *particular character*. Thus, in the common phrase διά τοῦτο, "for this cause," it is impossible, without referring to the context, to say whether the cause is *antecedent* (as in 16, v. 12, xiii. 6), or *final* (as in Philemon 15, τύχη γὰρ διά τοῦτο ἔχωρίσθη πρὸς ὅπα τὰ αἰνεῖν αὐτὸν ἀπέχεται). Compare 1 Tim. i. 13). If in the former case we choose to render διά τοῦτο "because of this," and in the latter case "for this purpose," we must not imagine that διά itself has these different meanings: we are simply transferring to the Preposition a distinction which belongs to the context. Thus, in v. 25, the use of διά in both clauses does not determine whether the causal relation is or is not of the same kind in both cases—"Christ died for our offences" may mean either "because we had offended," or "to atone for our offences." "Christ was raised for our justification," might mean, so far as Grammar is concerned, "because our justification was already accomplished," but in accordance with the immediate context (v. 24), and with the usual dogmatic representation, it much more probably, we may almost say certainly, means that He was raised in order that we might be justified.

## CHAPTER V.

1 Being justified by faith, we have peace with God, 2 and joy in our hope, 3 that sith we were reconciled by his blood, when we were enemies, 4 to we shall much more be saved being reconciled. 12 As sin and death came

by Adam, 17 so much more righteousness and life by Jesus Christ. 20 Where sin abounded, grace did superabound.

THEREFORE being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ:

### CHAP. V.—I-III. BLESSEDNESS OF THE JUSTIFIED.

St. Paul has shown that neither Gentile nor Jew had attained to righteousness by works (i. 18-iii. 20); he has described "the righteousness of God," which is exhibited in Christ's atoning death, and bestowed by God's grace as a free gift without works, and therefore without distinction of persons, upon all who by faith accept it (iii. 21-30); and he has proved by the example of Abraham, and

the testimony of David, that his doctrine of "righteousness by faith without works" is in harmony with Scripture (iii. 31-iv. 25). He now sets forth the blessedness of the justified, as consisting in present "peace with God," and joyful "hope of the glory of God," both resting on the death and life of Him, "by whom we have now received the atonement" (vv. 1-11).

1. Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God.] St. Paul speaks as one of

**2** By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we

stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.

those "who believe on Him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead" (iv. 24): thus there is a sound of confidence and triumph in his words, "**j**ustified therefore by faith we have peace with God." He speaks of justification as a thing already received; for he has respect only or chiefly to that act of grace, whereby God at first absolves the believer from all guilt, and receives him into a state of favour. That state of favour is here called "peace with God." On the distinction between present and final justification see Waterland, 'On the Eucharist,' ix. 2, and Barrow, vol. ii., Sermon v., p. 64.

On the marginal rendering, "let us have peace with God," see Note at end of chapter.

"*Peace with God*" (*π*ρός τὸ Θεόν) is not quite identical with "*the peace of God*." The former is the peace that puts an end to war and enmity, the new *relation with God*, into which the justified believer is admitted: he is no longer an enemy lying under wrath, but a son reconciled, restored and beloved. Upon this new *relation between God and man* is founded the work of the Holy Spirit in man, which results finally in the perfect harmony of the inner life, the deep tranquillity of a soul that has found its true happiness and rest, in a word, "*the peace of God*."

**2.** *By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand.*] Through whom also we have had our introduction by faith into this grace wherein we stand.

Though St. Paul has just before spoken of "Jesus our Lord, who was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification," he cannot describe the happy state into which we are thus brought, without again reminding us to whom our thanksgiving is due: "*we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.*"

The difference of tense in the two verses, unnoticed in the Authorised Version, is important: it shows that "**t**he introduction into this grace" is prior to "*peace with God*," that it is not a second and further effect of justification, but justification itself. Thus the word "*also*" points to the identity of the giver: He through whom we have peace, is the same through whom we have had the introduction into this grace; "who brought us near when we were far off" (Chrysostom). The reference of all to Christ is further seen in the word inadequately rendered "*access*:" it describes not our act, but Christ's, not our coming, but His bringing us. The distinction is observed by Chrysostom in the parallel passage, Ephe-

sians ii. 18, "For through Him we both have our introduction (A. V. *access*) by one Spirit unto the Father." He said not "*access*," but "*introduction*," for not of ourselves did we come near, but by Him were brought near. There is the same thought similarly expressed in 1 Pet. iii. 18, "*C*hrist also bath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God."

The words "*by faith*" (attested by a preponderance of authorities) indicate the act on man's part, in which he lays hold of Christ's arm outstretched to bring him near to God.

"*This grace wherein we stand,*" is a description of the state of the justified implying present favour and acceptance with God, and His help to keep us therein. Compare 1 Cor. xv. 1; 1 Pet. v. 12.

*and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.]* The word rendered "*rejoice*" is the same which has been already translated "*boast*" (ii. 17; iii. 27; iv. 2); it indicates not merely the inward joy of the heart, but the grateful and confident utterance of the lips. In contrast with all false boasting, the believer boasts in hope of the glory of God.

The clause itself is not dependent on either of those which precede it, but introduces a new and important element into the Apostle's description of the state of the justified: "*we have peace with God*," "*and we rejoice in hope of the glory of God.*"

And what is "*the glory of God?*" It is an eternal mystery which the heart of man cannot yet conceive, but of which Holy Scripture gives us here and there short glimpses. Like the righteousness of God, the truth of God, and the life of God (Eph. iv. 18), it has its hidden source in the Father, it is manifested in the Son, it is reflected in man: "*The glory which thou gavest me, I have given them*" (John xvii. 22).

Of this "*glory of God*" man was, from the first, designed to partake (1 Cor. xi. 7), but by sin all men "*come short*" or *suffer loss* of it (iii. 23); its restoration is wrought by the Spirit revealing and imparting the glory of Christ: "*We all with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord*" (2 Cor. iii. 18). In presenting this "*glory of God*," as an object of the believer's hope, the Apostle points to its future perfection in the glorification of our whole nature, body, soul, and spirit.

The glory in which man will thus be transfigured will still be "*the glory of God*," even as the sunshine resting upon earth is still the light of heaven; it will be an everlasting

**3 And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also : knowing that tribulation worketh patience ;**

glory, just because man will dwell for ever in the light of God's countenance.

**3. And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also.]** No sooner has the Apostle pointed to "the glory of God," as a light shining afar to cheer the believer on his course, than he thinks of the contrast between that bright distance and the darkness that lies around him here.

To weaker faith earthly sorrows might seem to dim the heavenly light : but to him hope shines out brighter through the gloom. The sudden transition from "glory" to "tribulations," brings out the fulness of the believer's triumph. St. Paul can promise no exemption from sorrow, for he knows "that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God" (Acts xiv. 22). Therefore he speaks here of "the tribulations," or "our tribulations," as the appointed portion of the faithful, just as our Lord told His disciples, "in the world ye shall have tribulations."

But the Apostle knew the sweet uses of adversity: he knew that "Christ nourisheth His Church by sufferings" (Jer. Taylor, "Faith and Patience of the Saints," part ii. 18), and that "the chastening of the Lord" is a discipline by which His children are prepared for glory. Therefore, looking through the clouds to the brightness beyond, he says, "**We rejoice also in our tribulations.**"

At once he justifies this boast by an appeal to the certain knowledge of Christian experience; "knowing (as we do) that tribulation worketh patience." He thus comforts the weak-hearted, by showing how tribulation works its own cure; for its first fruit is "patience." Our own word "patience" expresses little more than passive resistance to evil, the calm endurance of a soul that resigns itself to suffering. In this sense Julian used the Greek word in his scornful answer to the Christians who came before him to complain of persecution: "It is your part, when evil entreated, to be patient: for this is the commandment of your God."

But besides this passive element, the original word implies an active perseverance, a brave persistence in good works, that will not be shaken by fear of evil, and an abiding hope of final victory which no present dangers may disturb.

The word "worketh" (*karepyáσεται*), describes, not a transient operation, but a complete and permanent result; patience does not

**4 And patience, experience ; and experience, hope :**

**5 And hope maketh not ashamed ;**

pass away with the affliction that calls it into exercise, but remains as an effect *wrought out* upon the soul; an effect productive in its turn of a new fruit—"experience."

**4. And patience, experience.] And patience approval.** "Experience" does not exactly represent the Greek word *δοκιμή*. Metal that is purified in fire gains thereby an approved character: the fire in which man is purified is "affliction," the right endurance of which is "patience," and its result a certain quality or character marking the man of "proof." *Δοκιμή* sometimes means the process of this moral "assaying" (2 Cor. viii. 2 Wyclif), or "probation;" but here, as an effect wrought by "patience," it must rather be the result of the process "proof," or "approval." (Five Clergymen.)

**and experience, hope.]** "Approval" in its turn worketh hope, being in its very nature a pledge of perseverance unto the end.

Thus through a series of virtues each in its turn effect and cause, tribulation is "the nurse of our hope in the world to come." (Cyril Alex.)

**5. And hope maketh not ashamed.]** The hope fostered by this stern nurture is, as before, "the hope of the glory of God." The distinction so finely drawn out by Dr. Chalmers ('Lectures on Romans,' I. p. 284) between "the hope of faith" (v. 2) and "the hope of experience" (v. 4) must not be pressed too far. The same hope, which springs at first simply from faith in God, is strengthened by the victorious issue of the trials to which it is subjected through tribulation.

This hope, unlike that which rests on man, can never by its failure put us to shame, because it is founded upon God's unchanging love.

**because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts.]** Read, *because God's love has been poured out in our hearts.* Augustine understands by "the love of God," not that where-with He loves us, but that wherewith He makes us to love Him." ('De Spir. et Lit.' c. 32.)

This interpretation had been previously rejected by Origen as unsuited to the connexion of thought. The whole context shows that the Apostle means God's love towards us; the believer's hope rests not on anything in himself—not even on the happy consciousness of loving God—but on God's love to him in Christ, that love which is set forth in the following verses.

It is no valid objection to say that only the

because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.

*sense* of God's love, not that love itself, can be poured out in the heart.

Like an overflowing stream in a thirsty land, so is the rich flood of Divine love poured out and shed abroad in the heart.

The sense of God's love is at once awakened, even as the eye has a sense of the light that fills it; nevertheless that which has been poured out in the heart is not our sense of God's love, but the love itself embodied in the word to which the Holy Ghost gives life and power. Thus the true sequence of thought is maintained; our hope cannot disappoint us, because God's love—which is its own witness in our heart—is a pledge for its fulfilment.

*by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.]* Read "that was given;" and see Note on Acts xix. 2, *Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye became believers?* Here, however, St. Paul means, not an extraordinary gift, but one common to all believers, as is seen from the effect ascribed to it—the pouring out of God's love in the heart.

If we ask how the Holy Spirit pours out the love of God in the heart, we may find the answer in our Lord's words: "He shall testify of Me." "He shall glorify Me: for He shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you." Christ is the fountain from which God's love is poured forth in the heart.

6-8. That the hope founded on God's love cannot fail, is further proved in vv. 6-8, by a description of the surpassing greatness of that love, as shown in the fact that Christ died for us while we were still in our helpless and ungodly state.

*6. For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly.]* Rather, *Christ died in due time for the ungodly.* On the various readings see Note at the end of the chapter.

The words, "*when we were yet without strength,*" do not present man's helplessness as a *motive* of God's love (Meyer): the suggestion of a motive would only weaken the thought of the passage, that God's love was shown when there was nothing in man to invite, but everything to repel it. The clause forms part of the contrast between the believer's present state, strong in hope, in patience, in experience, and in the assurance of God's love, and the former state in which men weakened by sin and not yet having the gift of the Holy Ghost had neither the will nor the power to please God.

The phrase, "*in due time,*" or "*in season*"

*6 For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died* <sup>¶ Or, according to</sup> *for the ungodly.*

(καὶ καιρός) has been variously explained as (1) a time appointed by the Father, or (2) foretold by the prophets, or (3) opportune for St. Paul and his first readers; as if, in order to bring home more directly to that generation the sense of God's love, the Apostle had said, "Christ died opportunely for *us*: had He come later, *we* should have passed away unredeemed."

Such a thought is far too narrow and too selfish for St. Paul.

(4) The general state of the world was opportune for God's purpose.

By the contact of the Jews with the empire of Rome and the literature of Greece, the one true God must now become known to all, and therefore the partial and temporary dispensation must give place to the universal and final. "We believe that the wide empire of Rome was prepared by God's providence, in order that the nations which were to be called into the one body of Christ might be previously associated under the law of one empire." ('De Vocazione Gentium,' ii. 16.)

Man, the heir of the promise, was no longer a child to be kept under tutors and governors (Gal. iv. 2): with the growth of moral consciousness sin had reached its full development as positive transgression, and so the time for working a radical cure had arrived.

The common fault of such explanations is that they are arbitrary and have no support in the context: the one point there presented is that the time was opportune for showing the greatness of God's love. Whatever preparation the world had undergone, it was still lying visibly in ungodliness; and whatever other effects had been wrought by previous dispensations, they had helped to make man's weakness and unworthiness more manifest. Redemption effected under such conditions was seen to be the gift of God's free grace, not purchased or prepared by any partial improvement on man's part. Thus in accordance with the purpose of Him who justifieth the ungodly, Christ "died in due time for the ungodly": not for "*the ungodly*" as a class distinct from the godly, but for all as being ungodly. This is shown by the absence of the article in the Greek, as in the passage, "*I came not to call (the) righteous.*" God's love is magnified by the strong description of our unworthiness, as in iv. 5, where see Note on *ἀσεβῆς.*

*7, 8. Christ's dying for the ungodly is now shown to be a thing altogether surpassing all experience of human love· for among men*

**7** For scarcely for a righteous man will one die : yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die.

scarcely can any be found who will die for a righteous man, much less, as Christ did, for sinners and ungodly.

**7. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die.]** There is a distinction between the "righteous" or "just" man, who does simply what duty requires of him, and the "good man," whose benevolence, not being limited to the requirements of strict duty, may call forth such gratitude and love, that for him "peradventure some one even has the heart to die."

Thus, while the possibility implied in the former clause is more distinctly conceded, it is at the same time limited to rare examples of love inspired by the most attractive form of virtue. The more exalted the virtue which alone calls forth such love, the stronger is the contrast to the ungodliness and enmity of those for whom Christ died; and it is precisely this contrast which sets God's love above all human love. See note at end.

**8. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.]** "Commendeth," an excellent rendering, fully justified by St. Paul's usage (2 Cor. iii. 1; iv. 2; v. 12, &c.), and by the context. Christ's death for sinners not merely proves God's love to be a fact, but sets it before us in all its greatness and excellence, and so "commends" it to us.

The use of the present tense, and the frequent repetition in this verse of the first person, show how vividly St. Paul realised and appropriated the proof of God's love. Christ died once for all, yet in the enduring benefits of His death we have an ever-present proof of the Divine love to each of us.

The expression "yet sinners" conveys the idea that there was nothing in man to deserve God's love; compare v. 6.

Observe also, it is "*his own love towards us*" that God thus commands: "*his own*" (*τὴν ἑαυτοῦ*) in its origin, springing from the depths of the Divine nature; not called into existence by any goodness in its object (as in the supposed case of v. 7), for "*we were yet sinners;*" not a response to any love of ours, for we were His enemies. "*Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins*" (1 Joh. iv. 10).

Thus the chief thought of our passage is seen to be the contrast between God's love and man's love, not the distinction between the Father's love and Christ's love. Nevertheless,

**8 But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.**

**9 Much more then, being now**

it is *the Father's* love that thus surpasses all human love, and is proved by His giving His Son to die for His enemies. Two thoughts are thus suggested:

First, God's wrath against sin, is not inconsistent with the tenderest love towards sinners.

Secondly, the proof of God's love towards us, drawn from Christ's death, is strong in proportion to the closeness of the union between God and Christ.

Where would be the greatness of God's love, or how could it be compared to an act of self-sacrifice, if He, whom God gave to be a sacrifice for us, were not His own Son—His only begotten, His beloved?

**Christ died for us.]** Not "in our stead" (*ἀντὶ*), but "in our behalf" (*ὑπὲρ*). See Note at end of chapter.

The ideas which *ὑπὲρ* expresses, and *ἀντὶ* does not, are precisely those which make the death of Christ most precious. It would be enough to say that Christ died "in our stead" (*ἀντὶ*), if His death had been unconscious, unwilling, or accidental. But if as our champion, friend, and brother, He laid down His own life willingly for our sake, and if He was approved by God as our representative, so that when "*one died for all, then all died*," in and with Him (2 Cor. v. 15), then these thoughts must be expressed by saying, as St. Paul does, that He died *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*, in our behalf, and for our sake.

**9.** St. Paul has been showing that the hope of glory cannot fail, because it is founded on God's love, as manifested in the death of Christ (vv. 5–8). He now draws out more fully the force of this argument, by contrasting past circumstances with present.

*Then we were sinners, now we have been justified by Christ's blood; if He died for sinners, much more certain is it that He will save the justified.*

The expression, "*justified by his blood*," is worthy of note.

(1) Why is no mention made of faith? Because St. Paul is here viewing justification simply as a proof of God's love; and faith adds nothing to the gift of God, but only accepts it.

(2) It might be inferred from iv. 25 that our justification is less closely connected with our Lord's death than with His resurrection; that such an inference would be erroneous, is at once shown by the words, "*justified by his blood*."

justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him.

In fact, in one of its aspects, "justification of sinners comes to the same with remission" of sins. (Waterland, "Euch." c. ix.; Bull, "Harm. Apost." c. i. § 4.)

"The wrath" from which we shall be saved, cannot but be "*the wrath to come*" (ii. 5, 8; iii. 5; 1 Thess. i. 10). The believer hopes for greater things than merely to be saved from the wrath of God. But the apostle, by presenting salvation under this limited aspect, strengthens his argument for its certainty. If we have already received from God so great favour as to be reconciled and justified, much more shall we be saved from His wrath.

10. *For if, when we were enemies, &c.*] *For if, being enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his son, much more having been reconciled, we shall be saved in his life.* The preceding argument is both repeated in a more precise statement, and strengthened by another element of contrast between the past and the present; (1) if, being enemies, we were reconciled, much more, having been reconciled, we shall be saved; (2) if we were reconciled by the death of His Son, much more shall we be saved by His life.

(1) In what sense it is here said that we were "enemies" to God, and were "reconciled" to Him, cannot be decided by the mere words, for these are used to express relations existing on either side, or on both. We must look to the context, and to the scope of the argument.

"Reconciled," in v. 10, corresponds to "justified," in v. 9; and again, in v. 11, it is said, "we have RECEIVED the reconciliation." It is thus clear that "reconciliation" is a boon which God bestows; we are reconciled to Him, when we are restored to His favour: "*God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.*" (2 Cor. v. 19.)

From this meaning of "reconciliation," that of "enemies" is at once deduced. By God's enemies are here meant those who lie under His wrath, and they are reconciled to Him, when that wrath is removed in the remission of sins.

The same conclusion follows from the general scope of the argument. Throughout the passage (vv. 1-11) our hope is shown to rest, not on anything in man, but solely on God's love. How is it consistent with this, to ground the greater certainty of salvation upon any change in our feeling towards God?

(1) The first change wrought through

10 For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the

Christ's death, is not in man's feeling, but in his state, and consequently in his relation to an unchanging God.

This interpretation of the passage may be confirmed by considering some of the difficulties which have been felt concerning it.

If God loved us when we were yet sinners (v. 8), how could we be at the same time regarded by Him as enemies?

Does St. Paul speak only in a figure of God being angry? Or, is God's anger nothing else than the misery which, by His appointment, waits on sin?

We must remember that to describe God's moral attributes, man has no other words than those which are borrowed from his own nature.

It may not be possible to divest such words as "anger," "hatred," and "love," of some associations which, being merely human, are inappropriate to God.

But man's moral nature (we speak not now of its corruption, but of its essence) is the image of God. And when we say that God loveth righteousness and hateth iniquity, we mean a *love* and a *hate* which are real, personal, and conscious. Compare Hooker, "E. P.," Bk. V., Appendix i. vol. ii. p. 570 (Kebble's edition).

Thus it is no figure, but a deep and essential truth, that God hates sin; and since sin is necessarily personal, the *sinner as such*, i.e. "so far as he wilfully identifies himself with his sin" (Godet), is hated of God, His enemy (c. xi. 28).

But God loves everything that He has made. He cannot love man as a sinner, but He loves him as man, even when he is a sinner. In like manner the Jews are described as being at the same time enemies in one relation and beloved in another (xi. 28).

Human love here offers a true analogy: the more a father loves his son, the more he hates in him the drunkard, the liar, or the traitor.

Thus God, loving as His creatures those whom He hates as self-made sinners, devises means whereby they may be brought back unto Him.

By the death of His Son, sins are put away; man, being represented by Christ, is no longer a sinner in God's sight, but righteous, and as such reconciled or restored to His favour.

Hence the force of the Apostle's argument: if God's love reconciled us when we were His enemies, much more will it save us, after we have been reconciled.

(2) The verse contains a second contrast between the means of our reconciliation, and

death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.

**11** And not only *so*, but we also

joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement.

**12** Wherefore, as by one man

of our continued salvation: if reconciled through the *death* of His Son, much more shall we be saved in His *life*, not merely “*by*” but “*in his life*,” as partakers thereof. (Compare John v. 26; xiv. 19.)

Some have thought that the point of comparison here is power.

Christ in His death sank in humiliation and weakness under the wrath of God. Christ now liveth as our eternal Mediator, Intercessor, and King, unto whom all power is given in heaven and in earth. If His death had power to restore us to God's favour, how much more shall His life have power to save us from wrath?

But throughout the passage from *v. 5*, St. Paul speaks, not of God's *power*, but of His *love*, as the foundation of our hope. It was a greater trial of love to reconcile us by Christ's death, than to save us in His life; it cost more to redeem us at first, than it will now cost to save us unto the end. The argument is *à fortiori*, from the greater to the less.

**11.** *And not only so, but we also joy in God.*] On the reading and construction, see the note at the end of the chapter.

From the fact of our having been reconciled to God (*v. 10*), two results follow, *not only* a future salvation, *but also* a present rejoicing in God.

The train of thought, and the word rendered “*joy*” or “*rejoice*,” are the same as in *vv. 1, 2*; and here, as there, St. Paul reminds us that our glorying in God is maintained through the same Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we, who were former enemies, have now been reconciled to God.

*The atonement.*] Read, *the reconciliation*, as in *xi. 15*, and *2 Cor. v. 18, 19*. The word “*atonement*,” which in the O. T. constantly means “*expiation*,” occurs in the N. T. only here, being substituted for the proper word “*reconciliation*.”

**12-21.** *AS IN ADAM ALL DIE, EVEN SO IN CHRIST SHALL ALL BE MADE ALIVE.*

So far, St. Paul has shown that sin is in fact universal in mankind, and that through Christ alone God has provided for all righteousness and life. He now deepens and strengthens his argument by showing that the cause of this universality of sin, and of its consequence, death, is the unity of mankind

in Adam; and that, corresponding to this, there is a higher unity in Christ, who thus, as the true head and representative of the human race, becomes by His obedience unto death, a source of life and righteousness for all.

It is thus evident that the comparison between Adam and Christ is no rhetorical illustration, but an earnest, argumentative statement of two great truths in their essential connexion, universal sinfulness and universal redemption.

The comparison is based upon the derivation of sin and death from Adam, which is thus treated as a known and admitted fact. St. Paul's representation of it is wholly derived from the original narrative in Genesis; he introduces no new feature, and it is therefore gratuitous to assume that he drew from any other source. Traces of the same doctrine in the Apocryphal books (*Wisdom*, ii. 24; *Ecclesiasticus* xxv. 24), and in Rabbinical writings, so far as they show the opinion prevalent among the Jews, may tend more or less to confirm, but cannot possibly weaken, the Apostle's testimony to the historical truth of the Fall, as the source of sin and death. (*John viii. 44*.)

The master-thought of the whole passage is that unity of the *many in the one*, which forms the point of comparison between Adam and Christ.

“Throughout he clings to “*the one*,” and continually brings this forward, saying, “As by *one man* sin entered into the world,” and “in the trespass of *the one the many died*,” and “Not as through *one* having sinned is the gift,” and “The judgment was from *one* unto condemnation,” and again, “For if by the trespass of *the one* death reigned through *the one*,” and “Therefore as through *one* trespass,” and again, “As through the disobedience of *the one man the many* were made sinners,” and he constantly repeats “*the one*,” in order that when the Jew says to you, “How by the well-doing of *one*, Christ, was the world saved?” you may be able to say to him, “How by the disobedience of *one*, Adam, was the world condemned?” (Chrysostom.)

The same recapitulation of the human race in Adam and in Christ is taught in *1 Cor. xv. 22*. “*For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.*”

*12. Wherefore.*] “*For this cause*,”—namely, that Christ died and rose again for

sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed

upon all men, <sup>for that all have sinned:</sup> <sub>Or in whom.</sub>

us, that we might be justified and saved through Him (8-11).

*as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin.] As through one man sin entered into the world, and through sin death.* The comparison here begun would be formally completed thus: "so by one man righteousness entered into the world, and life through righteousness." But after the digression in vv. 13, 14, St. Paul, instead of resuming his unfinished sentence, glides back, as his manner is (c. iii. 25, 26; Eph. iii. 3, 4), into his former course of thought in the words, "*Adam, who is a figure of him that was to come.*" The parenthesis assumed in the Authorised Version is thus seen to be inadmissible. The words, "*through one man,*" are placed first for the sake of emphasis, because they contain the point of comparison, and so affect the whole verse.

"*Sin*" is here viewed as a whole, and St. Paul points to the source from which all human sin has flowed; any distinction therefore between the propensity, the act, or the habit, would here be out of place.

"*The world,*" into which "*sin entered through one man,*" is the human race (c. iii. 19; xi. 15). The previous existence of sin and death outside the world of man, is a matter untouched by the Apostle's statement.

Why is not Eve mentioned, who sinned before Adam (2 Cor. xi. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 14; Sirach xxv. 24)?

Because the exact point touched by St. Paul is not who first sinned, nor how sin arose in Adam, but how it became universal in mankind.

"*Adam was first formed, then Eve*" (1 Tim. ii. 13). "*The man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man*" (1 Cor. xi. 8). Thus does St. Paul define the position of Adam as the founder and representative of the race, through whom life was transmitted to all, and with life also sin and death (Gen. v. 3).

*and death by sin.] and through sin death.* That death must here be understood in its primary sense as the death of the body, is clear from the connexion with v. 14, where no other meaning is admissible, and from the unmistakable reference to the narrative in Genesis (Gen. ii. 17), and the sentence there pronounced, "*Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return*" (Gen. iii. 19). See Wisdom ii. 24; 1 Cor. xv. 21.

Though bodily death is regarded in Genesis and by St. Paul as the *divinely appointed*

*punishment of sin, it may be none the less its natural consequence.* When the immortality, which would have been the reward of Adam's obedience, was forfeited by his sin, the earthly frame would *naturally* return to its dust. Here, however, the great truth asserted by St. Paul is, that bodily death is in man the result of sin; a view familiar to us as Christians, but not to the heathen, who regarded death, "not as a punishment, but as either a necessity of nature, or a rest from toils and troubles" (Cic. in Cat. iv. 7).

If we try to grasp more than is contained in the passage, by introducing the ideas of "moral death," and "the second death," we relax our hold on the fundamental truth that bodily death is the penalty of Adam's sin.

Nor is this an imaginary danger, for some have been led on so far as to deny that the death of the body was at all included in the death threatened to Adam as the penalty of his sin (August. Serm. ccxcix. 10, 11—against the Pelagians).

"Moral" or "spiritual death" is a figurative expression for sin itself, and therefore cannot be included in death, when death is distinguished—as here—from sin.

"*The second death,*" as is shown by the very phrase, and by the context in which it occurs (Rev. xx. 13, 14; xxii. 8), does not begin till after the general resurrection and the final judgment. To introduce such an idea into the present passage is to confound the last judgment, of which it is said, "*they were judged every man according to their works,*" with the judgment pronounced upon Adam in Gen. iii. 19, which extended in its effects equally to all his descendants, prior to any consideration of each man's works, and without any distinction between the evil and the good.

Erroneous views of the passage have arisen from overlooking several important considerations.

1. St. Paul brings into the comparison only those effects of Adam's transgression which are *transmitted to all his posterity*, namely the inheritance of death and of a sinful nature; while God's final judgment is based solely on personal and *individual responsibility*.

2. The death of Christ does not *precisely reverse* the effects of Adam's sin, it *overpowers* them by greater gifts.

3. The death of the body as denounced upon Adam could not be regarded as a merely temporary separation of body and soul, but only as the beginning of a permanent state. Hence the gloomy view of death which

13 (For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law.

pervades the Old Testament, except in a few remarkable prophecies. It was only when Christ "brought life and immortality to light" by His own resurrection, that the Christian view of death as a temporary separation of body and soul, a transition to a higher life, could be realised.

*and so]. I.e. through sin which had itself come in through one man.*

*death passed upon all men.] "Passed through unto all men."*

*for that all have sinned.] Read "for that all sinned."*

On  $\epsilon\phi'\phi$  see Note at end.

That dependence of the death of all upon the sin of one, which is already implied in the word "so," is more fully and precisely stated in the clause, "for that all sinned." We have already remarked that the words "through one man" affect the whole verse: their influence on this last clause is most important, determining its meaning to be "for that all sinned through one man": compare 2 Cor. v. 14, "If one died for all, then they all died," i.e. in the one. In both passages the Authorised Version ("have sinned," "were all dead") is inaccurate.

Sin and death not only "entered into" the human race, but also "passed through" to every member of it "through one man."

That death extended to all is a patent fact: and since death entered "through sin" and "so" passed on, it is presupposed that "all sinned." Only thus is the cause "sin" co-extensive with the effect "death": at the same time, since "all sinned" through one, it is equally true that "by the offence of the one the many died" (v. 15).

The Apostle's whole reasoning rests on these two principles: (1) Sin is the cause of death; (2) By virtue of the unity of mankind sin and death are both transmitted from one to all. Thus the sin of the many and the death of the many are included in the sin of the one and the death of the one, and there at their common source the connexion between sin and death is fixed once for all. "The covenant of life, entered into with Adam in his state of innocence, was by his sin made void, not only for himself, but also for his posterity; so that now all sons of Adam, as such" [i.e. apart from Christ], "are quite shut out from any promise of immortality, and subjected to a necessity of dying, without hope of resurrection. No proposition in all theology is more certain than this: for it is everywhere stated most

14 Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the

plainly and expressly in the N. T. scriptures, especially in the Epistle to the Romans throughout almost the whole 5th chapter" (Bp. Bull, 'Examen Censure, Anim.' xvii. p. 208). Theodoret's comment, "For not on account of his forefather's sin, but on account of his own, each man receives the doom of death," is as directly opposed to St. Paul's argument as it is to experience and theology: the error arises from confounding the sentence of bodily death, which through one man's sin extended to all, with the sinner's final doom.

13, 14. St. Paul pursues the thought that "all sinned through one," and that *on this account* death passed upon all. His proof is drawn from the case of those who died before a law was given, and rests on the principle already stated in iv. 15, that "where no law is, there is no transgression."

First he states as a known fact that during the period from Adam to Moses, that is, "*until the law, there was sin in the world.*"

But as "*sin is not imputed*," not brought into account against the sinner (see Philemon v. 18), "*when there is no law,*" men could not then bring upon themselves the penalty of death, as Adam did, because they could not sin, as Adam, against a known law. There was sin, but not in the form of transgression, and therefore not taken into account.

Their own sin then was not the cause that men died. But they did die: "*death reigned from Adam to Moses even over those who sinned not after the similitude of the transgression of Adam.*"

And as sin is the cause of death (v. 12), and Adam's sin alone could be taken into account, they died through Adam's sin. This is substantially Chrysostom's interpretation.

The unavoidable inference that *through one man's sin* all died is only for a moment deferred; in vv. 15, 17, and 19 it is affirmed in express terms.

Meanwhile through the introduction of Adam's name the Apostle is able to return to the comparison begun in v. 12. Thus the relative clause "*who is the figure of him that was to come*" serves a double purpose: it implies indirectly the conclusion to be drawn from vv. 13, 14, that all sinned and died in Adam, who is thus a "figure" or a "type" of Him in whom all are justified and made alive; and it enables St. Paul to resume and complete his unfinished comparison.

similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.

This comparison is here confined to the effects in man of Adam's sin and of Christ's obedience: it does not embrace (as in 1 Cor. xv. 24-28) man's lordship over the creatures as typical of Christ's universal dominion in the "times of the restitution of all things." Our Authorised Version therefore rightly renders, "him which *was to come*," not "which *is to come*."

*15. But not as the offence, so also is the free gift.]* But not as the trespass, so also is the act of grace. The comparison between Adam and Christ is at the same time a contrast: they are alike in that they both stand at the head of the human race, and so extend the influence of their acts to all; unlike in the nature of those acts, and the consequences that flow from them. "Rabbi Yose, the Galilean said, 'Come forth and learn the righteousness of the King Messiah, and the reward of the just from the first man, who received but one commandment, a prohibition, and transgressed it: consider how many deaths were inflicted upon himself, upon his own generations, and upon those that followed them, till the end of all generations. Which attribute is the greater, the attribute of goodness, or the attribute of vengeance?' He answered, 'The attribute of goodness is the greater; and the attribute of vengeance is the less; how much more, then, will the King Messiah, who endures affliction and pains for the transgressors (as it is written, '*He was wounded,*' &c.), justify all generations! and this is what is meant, when it is said, '*And the Lord made the iniquity of us all meet upon him.*'" (Neubauer, 'Jewish Interpreters of Isai,' lili. p. 11.)

The word rendered "*the offence*" is the same which is applied to Adam's sin in Wisdom x. 1, and there rendered "*his fall*": in the Gospels it is translated "*trespass*" (Mat. vi. 14; Mar. xi. 25). The strict contrast to Adam's *trespass* is Christ's *obedience*, but St. Paul, regarding them both chiefly in their influence on mankind, passes on at once to the effect of that obedience, namely the *act of grace* by which the effect of the *trespass* is annulled. On the various applications of *χάρισμα* see note on i. 11: here it indicates the act of God's free grace in pardoning and justifying.

*For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.]* Read: "For if

15 But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much

by the trespass of the one the many died, much more did the grace of God and his gift abound unto the many in the grace of the one man Jesus Christ." "If" does not here imply uncertainty, but lays a basis for argument: that "by the trespass of the one the many died," has been already proved: much more certain is it that the grace abounded unto the many, for God's grace flows more freely than His wrath. The word rendered "*gift*" (*δωρέα*) is used in the New Testament only of God's greatest and best gifts, as Christ himself, the Holy Ghost, and his gifts (John iv. 10; Acts ii. 38; viii. 20; x. 45; 2 Cor. ix. 15; Eph. ii. 8; iv. 7): here it means "*the gift of righteousness*" (v. 17). "*The grace of God*" and "*his gift*" differ only as cause and effect; their essential unity is perhaps indicated in the Greek by the singular number of the verb which follows.

"*The grace of God*" abounded "in the grace of the one man Christ Jesus," even as the water of the fountain abounds in the river.

"*The grace abounded*" in the sense that it was not limited to a reversal of the effects of Adam's sin: it did not restore in the same form that which had been lost in Adam, but bestowed far more in new and better gifts. The penalty of death is not abolished: but a new life is imparted, in which death itself is to be swallowed up at the resurrection: man is not put back into that unstable innocence from which Adam fell, but his sins are forgiven: the corruption of nature, which we inherit prior to any exercise of our own will, is compensated by those secret influences of the Spirit wherein He strives with us even against our will. And to those who will accept the grace, it brings both greater abundance of grace here, and the sure hope of glory hereafter.

"*The many*" unto whom the gift abounded "by the grace of the one man Christ Jesus" must include "*the many*" who died "by the trespass of the one."

The gift "abounded unto the many," inasmuch as Christ's redeeming work has won grace for all men: there is no limit in the gift itself, but only in man's willingness to accept it.

The Authorised Version loses the full meaning of the expression "*the one man*," that is the head and representative of mankind, "*the last Adam*," the beginning of the new creation, "*the firstborn among many brethren*" (Rom. viii. 29).

more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.

16 And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.

**16. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift:]** This should be rendered as one clause: **"and the gift is not as through one having sinned."**

In v. 15 the argument depends on the contrast in the nature of the trespass and the gift, that is of sin and grace: in v. 16 the contrast refers, not to quality, but to quantity; the gift of justification is greater than the condemnation, because it is occasioned, not by one offence, but by many. Adam received a law with a definite penalty attached to it; his sin was therefore a distinct and formal "trespass," which was at once "imputed" or taken into account. The command had been given to Adam while he was yet alone, "Thou shalt not eat," "in the day that thou eatest, thou shalt surely die:" so to Adam alone is the condemnation addressed, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." But the sentence thus pronounced upon our first father alone extended in its effects to all his children: "*the judgment was from one unto condemnation.*" It was otherwise with the gift: "*the gift was not as through one having sinned.*" The one trespass from which judgment proceeded was followed (*when and how* we shall be told afterwards), by many trespasses, every one of which deserving condemnation became a fresh occasion for unmerited forgiveness: thus "*the free gift was from many trespasses unto justification.*" "*Condemnation*" (*κατάκριμα*) and *justification* (*δικαιώμα*) here correspond to each other: each describes not an act in process, but an act done, a sentence passed. As one judgment unto condemnation extended to all, so for all there is but one free gift unto justification, the application of which to each believer is expressed by a different form of the word as a "*justifying*" (v. 18).

17. The statement that "*the free gift is unto justification,*" (v. 16), is now confirmed from the certainty that a still greater blessing will follow. The argument is no mere repetition of v. 15: it gathers up and carries onward the results already attained in vv. 15, 16; but it also adds a new contrast between the reign of death and the reign of the justified in life.

17 For if <sup>1 Or, by</sup> one man's offence <sup>one offence.</sup> death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.)

18 Therefore as <sup>1 Or, by</sup> the offence <sup>one offence.</sup> of one judgment came upon all men

The conclusion of v. 15, that "*the grace of God and his gift abounded unto the many,*" is here assumed in the words "*they which receive the abundance of the grace and of the gift of righteousness.*"

The conclusion of v. 16 is also assumed in the same clause: for as "*the free gift is unto justification,*" it is now more closely defined as "*the gift of righteousness*" and *as received now.*

They then who receive this gift of righteousness now will surely receive also the gift of life hereafter.

This assurance is not made to depend solely on the intrinsic connection between righteousness and life: it is made doubly sure by the contrast with the gloomy reign of sin and death.

*For if by one man's offence.]* The reading represented in the margin ("by one offence") has been adopted by some critics; but it has less authority, and does not agree so well with the corresponding clause at the end of the verse. Translate: "*For if by the trespass of the one death reigned through the one, much more they which receive the abundance of the grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life through the one, Jesus Christ.*"

We may notice a difference of expression in the two clauses. "*Death reigned*"; under his tyranny man's free agency is destroyed: the justified shall themselves "*reign in life*"; for life eternal is the element in which man's personal and conscious activity shall find its glorious development. The blessing here promised is far more than the restoration of what was lost through Adam: it is promised therefore not to all unconditionally, but to those who *accept* that gift of righteousness which is offered to all.

18. *Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.*] This verse gathers up the various contrasts of the whole passage (vv. 12-17) in a summary conclusion.

That the marginal renderings are the more correct, will be seen by comparing in the Greek v. 18 with v. 19. The Authorised

<sup>¶</sup> Or, by the one righteoussness. to condemnation; even so 'by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.

Version supplies in the first clause "judgment came," and in the second "the free gift came": on grammatical and rhetorical grounds it is inconceivable that two subjects standing in contrast could both be thus omitted.

There is no complete proposition, but a kind of exclamation, which is perfectly intelligible without any addition.

"So then as through one trespass, unto all men, to condemnation; so also through one justificatory sentence, unto all men, to justification of life."

St. Paul does not repeat the strictly logical contrast of v. 16, between "trespass" and "gift of grace," "condemnation" and "justificatory sentence;" but advancing upon that conclusion, he now sets against the "one trespass" the "one justificatory sentence," and against the "condemnation," as reaching to all, the justifying process, or "justification of life" unto all.

The words "all men" must have the same extent in both clauses: and as the condemnation passed upon "all men" in the proper sense of the word "all," so the "one justificatory sentence" leads in God's purpose unto justification of life for all. The realisation of this purpose in individual men depends upon their accepting by faith the justification designed for them. But it is not St. Paul's purpose to bring out here, more fully than he has already done in v. 17, this subjective condition of justification; he is speaking of the one justification through Christ as equally comprehensive with the one condemnation through Adam.

*justification of life]* "A justification by which we are recalled from the death of sin unto the life of grace and glory" (Corn. a Lapide). This interpretation is confirmed by v. 21, "that grace might reign through righteousness unto eternal life." Compare Bull, 'Exam. Censura,' Anim. iii.

The genitive expresses the effect or purpose: "justification" is unto, or in order to, "life" (Winer, § 30; Green, § 270).

19. One point in the comparison is still incomplete. Adam's "trespass" has been contrasted, not, as we might have expected, with Christ's obedience, but with the moving cause of that obedience, His grace (v. 15), and with the result purchased by His obedience, and bestowed by His grace, "the gift of righteousness" (v. 17), and the "justificatory sentence" (v. 18).

19 For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

It remains to show the means by which Christ's grace wrought these effects, viz., His obedience itself, and so to present the exact contrast to that one transgression, by which all were made sinners. This is now done, and the summary given in v. 18 is thereby explained and confirmed.

"For as by the disobedience of the one man the many were made sinners, so also by the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous."

The words "were made sinners" have been very variously interpreted: "became sinners,"—"were proved to be,"—"were regarded and treated as being sinners,"—these all miss the exact force of the word (*καβοταρθατοι*), which points to the *formal essence*, to that which constitutes men sinners. St. Paul has shown in v. 13 that sin may exist without being taken into account, i. e., without *formally constituting* the man a sinner. But Adam's disobedience, being a formal transgression, caused an essential and formal change in his moral state: he and all his descendants were at once formally constituted sinners ("peccatores constituti sunt," *Vulgata*), and as such were subjected to death. The clause states explicitly, what is already contained in v. 12, that "through one man . . . all sinned."

As Adam's disobedience consisted in one single act, so by the obedience contrasted with it, we must understand the one crowning act of Christ's obedience (Phil. ii. 8), His submission to death. Yet this death in its atoning power presupposes a sinless life: one act constitutes disobedience, but a perfect life is needful to a complete obedience.

The effect of Christ's obedience, like that of Adam's disobedience, is in its objective aspect universal and immediate. If we look only to Christ's work, and God's gift, all is at once completed. As in Adam the many were made sinners prior to any consideration of their own sins; so in Christ, solely on account of the merits of His obedience, apart from, and prior to any righteous deeds or dispositions of their own, the many shall "be made righteous" (*κατασταθησονται*), i. e. not merely declared righteous, or put into the position of righteous men, and treated as such, but constituted righteous.

For as our union with Adam made us all participants in the effects of his transgression, and thereby constituted us sinners; so union with Christ, who is our righteousness, is that which constitutes us essentially and formally righteous.

**20** Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound :

The ideas of inherent sin and inherent righteousness belong to the following chapters : to introduce them by anticipation here is to confuse the Apostle's argument, which here regards justification in its objective aspect, as wrought by God through Christ.

The future "*shall be made righteous*," does not refer to the future judgment, for it is not St. Paul's habit to view justification as something future, but as present, and already attained. It is because justification, though perfected on Christ's part in one act, extends onwards in its effect to generations yet unborn, that it is described as future.

**20. Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound.]** "But law came in beside, that the trespass might be multiplied."

As the sin of Adam and the grace of Christ have been presented as the main elements and moving powers in man's history, the question naturally occurs—what was the purpose of the law? What was its relation to sin and to righteousness?

Besides this general association with the preceding passage, the law has been expressly mentioned in it: "*Until the law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed where there is no law*," v. 13. Why then, it may be asked, was the law given? What purpose did it serve?

Again, in v. 16, the one offence of Adam is contrasted with "*many trespasses*." Whence came these many trespasses? That question is now answered.

Sin had come into the world before (v. 12), and remained in the world (v. 13): but sin without law is not taken into account (v. 13), and does not constitute *trespass* or *transgression* (iv. 15): therefore *law came in beside* (sin), in order that the *trespass might be multiplied*. Compare Gal. iii. 19, "*The law was added because of (for the sake of) transgressions*."

Do these words attribute to God, as the author of the law, the purpose of increasing sin?

To answer this question fully here, would be to anticipate the course of St. Paul's own argument; for in c. vii. he enters into a full discussion of the nature and effect of the law. At present we must notice only such points as arise directly out of this passage.

1. According to Chrysostom and other Greek commentators, it is only an *effect* of the law, not a *purpose*, that is stated. But

**21** That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.

this interpretation weakens the natural force of the Apostle's words, and only partially solves the difficulty: for an *effect* of the law must have been foreseen, and therefore in some sense included in its purpose.

2. The words mean, not "that the trespass might increase" merely in man's consciousness and knowledge of it, but "might be multiplied actually": this sense is also required by the connexion with the "many offences" in v. 16 which cannot be actual.

But on the other hand we must observe that—

3. The purpose stated is not that *sin*, but that "*the trespass*" might increase; that sin which already existed, however dormant or unrecognised (vii. 7, 8, 13), might take the definite form of active "trespass," or transgression of a known law. That *sin* itself increased is stated in the next clause, not as a *purpose*, but as an *effect*, and that an effect overruled for good by the superabundance of grace.

4. The increase of the *trespass* is not the *primary purpose* of the law, corresponding to God's *principal* or *signified* will, which is that men should observe the law to do it. Compare Hooker, 'Eccle. Pol.' B. v. Appendix I., p. 573, in Keble's edition.

5. It is not the *ultimate purpose* of the law, but only an intermediate purpose, a mean to an end: the ultimate purpose is "*that grace might reign through righteousness*." (v. 21.)

*But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.]* The Authorised Version uses the same word "*abound*" for two different Greek words: render, "*but where sin multiplied, grace superabounded*," so as to surpass the increase of sin.

21. "In this, God acted, not with cruelty but for the purpose of healing. For sometimes a man thinks himself whole, and is sick; and inasmuch as he is sick, and perceives it not, he seeks not a physician: the disease is increased, the inconvenience grows, the physician is sought, and all is healed" (Augustine, Ps. cii. 15).

Here St. Paul speaks more strongly of the increased power of sin, when the remedy appears, and God's full purpose is declared. Yet he does not say, as in the Authorised Version, "*Sin hath reigned unto death*," but "*in death*," as a province which it had won, and wherein it exercised its dominion. Death therefore, must be understood in the same sense, as in vv. 12, 14.

But the reign of sin and death has been overpowered by the superabundance of grace, "that grace might reign unto eternal life." Grace is conquering, and has yet to conquer, the kingdom of sin and death, before it can enter into the full possession of its own kingdom. This conquest it carries on through its own royal gift of "righteousness;" the boundless realm *unto* which it shall attain, but

which will still stretch out for ever and ever before it, is "*eternal life*."

Once again in sight of that kingdom our thoughts are turned to the King Himself. "Of Adam we hear no more: Christ alone is remembered" (Bengel). Grace shall "*reign through righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord*."

### ADDITIONAL NOTES on vv. 1, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12.

The Margin, "let us have peace with God," represents a reading *ἔχωμεν* attested by a great majority of uncial MSS., Versions, and Fathers, and adopted by Tischendorf (8), Tregelles, Westcott, Fritzsche, Hofmann, &c. On the other hand, *ἔχομεν* is found in B<sup>3</sup> ΙΙΙ F G (not in f g) P, most cursives, the later Syriac, and a few Fathers, including probably Tertullian, who seems to be wrongly claimed for the other reading: *ἔχουμεν* is preferred on internal grounds by Meyer, De Wette, Lange, Philippi, Reiche, Cremer, Scrivener, McClellan, Alford, Wordsworth.

There is a similar variation between *ἔχομεν* and *ἔχομεν* in Hebrews xii. 28. Here the reading *ἔχομεν*, having so great a preponderance of external testimony, the first duty of candid criticism is to consider whether it offers any meaning in harmony with the context.

1. Fritzsche, who prefers *ἔχωμεν*, writes thus: "It is evident that, if you replace *ἔχωμεν* in v. 1, *κανχώμεθα* in vv. 2, 3 is Conjunctional, not Indicative." But Fritzsche has overlooked the fact that the Conjunctional Mood is absolutely excluded by the categorical negative (*οὐ*) which follows: the force of this argument is not affected by the various reading *κανχώμενοι*, v. 3.

2. Hofmann, avoiding Fritzsche's error, throws the emphasis on the words "*through Jesus Christ*," and makes the two clauses *καὶ ἐσχήκαμεν* and *καὶ κανχώμεθα* parallel to each other. "Because it is Jesus Christ through whom we not only have had our access to this grace wherein we stand, but also rejoice in hope of the glory of God; therefore we may be exhorted that through Him we should let our relation to God be a relation of peace."

To this interpretation, which is substantially that of Origen and Chrysostom, several objections are made.

(1) "The emphasis, which obviously rests in the first instance on *δικαιωθέντες* and then on *εἰρήνην*, is taken to lie on *διὰ τὸν Κυρίον ἡμῶν Ι. Χ.*" (Meyer).

We may answer that these important words are naturally brought as close as pos-

sible to the relative clause dependent on them, and at the same time receive the emphasis which belongs to the close of the sentence.

(2) The exhortation, "let us have peace with God, and not become His enemies again through fresh sins," is said to be out of place in this 5th chapter, throughout which St. Paul is stating the actual effects of justification, "*we have peace with God*," and "*we rejoice in hope of the glory of God*."

To this we may reply, that the Apostle, beginning his exhortation in v. 1, and grounding it upon the benefits already received through Christ, is led on into a fuller statement of the nature, cause, and extent of those benefits (vv. 3-21), and only resumes his practical exhortation in vi. 1.

(3) Mr. Scrivener concludes, "that the itacism *ω* for *ο*, so familiar to all collators of Greek manuscripts, crept into some very early copy, from which it was propagated among our most venerable codices, even those from which the earliest versions were made:—that this is one out of a small number of well-ascertained cases in which the united testimonies of the best authorities conspire in giving a worse reading than that preserved by later and (for the most part) quite inferior copies."

Against this we may fairly set the opposite conclusion of Tischendorf that the testimony for *ἔχωμεν* is obviously overpowered by that in favour of *ἔχομεν*, and therefore "*ἔχωμεν* cannot be rejected unless it be altogether inappropriate, and inappropriate it seemingly is not."

Without presuming to decide between such accomplished critics, we are bound to express our own opinion that the internal grounds of objection to *ἔχωμεν* are not sufficient to outweigh the great preponderance of external testimony in its favour: but in a case where scholars of the greatest authority differ so widely, we think it better to retain in our footnotes and revised Version the reading of the received Text.

6. I. "Ἐπι γὰρ Χριστὸς ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν

**κατὰ καιρὸν ἵπερ ἀστεῖῶν ἀπέθανεν.** This is the reading of the Textus Receptus, and is found in D<sup>o</sup> K P 17 37 47 Arm.

II. The same reading with the addition of a second *τι* after *ἀσθενῶν* is found in R A C D<sup>o</sup> 31 (istud omnium corruptionum receptaculum, *Reiche*) 137 Syr.

III. Instead of *τι γάρ* the following variations are found :

- |                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| (1) <i>εἰ γέ</i>      | B fuld. Aeth.  |
| (2) <i>εἰ γάρ</i>     | Cop. Isid. Pelus. August.<br>(“ <i>si enim</i> ,” Epist. 149, De Pecc. Merit. i. 43) |
| (3) <i>εὶ δέ</i>      | Syr. (Schaaf)  |
| (4) <i>τι δέ</i>      | L  |
| (5) <i>εἰς τι γάρ</i> | D <sup>b</sup> F G<br>ut quid enim d e f g Vulg. Iren.<br>Faustin.                   |

Of these authorities B D<sup>b</sup> F G August. add the second *τι* after *ἀσθενῶν*.

On this evidence we have to make the following remarks.

(a) The position of the first *τι*, separated by *Xριστός* from the words to which it belongs (*οὐτων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν*) is very unusual. Reiche in his Critical Commentary excuses it on the ground that St. Paul wished to give emphasis to both thoughts, (1) that it was *Christ the Son of God* who died; (2) that He died while we were yet sinners. But this explanation is far from satisfactory.

(b) The double *τι* has never been satisfactorily explained, and the connexion which Tischendorf indicates by his punctuation, *οὐτων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν τι*, is opposed to the rule, universally observed in the N. T., that *τι* in a Participle clause precedes the Participle.

On the other hand, the repetition of *τι* is very easily explained by the confusion of the various readings.

(c) Of the variations for *τι γάρ* the most noticeable is III. (5) *εἰς τι γάρ*. It is thought by Reiche to have been formed from the Latin “*ut quid enim*,” and “*ut quid*” is used in the Vulgate for *εἰς τι*, e.g. Matt. xxvi. 8, Mar. xiv. 4, as well as for *ἴwa τι*, Matt. ix. 4, xxvii. 46, Lu. xiii. 7, Acts vii. 26, 1 Cor. x. 29.

Stieren (Irenaeus, I. III. c. xvi. § 9) acutely remarks that Irenaeus seems to have read *ἴwa τι γάρ*. We may add, that owing to the preceding *ημν*, *ἴwa τι* would easily lose its first syllable, and the remaining letters *art* be changed into *τι*. *ἴwa τι γάρ*, or *εἰς τι γάρ*, with the same general sense as the received reading, would give a livelier turn to the expression: “For to what purpose (if our hope is after all to disappoint us) did Christ die, &c.?”

Dr. Westcott (‘Dict. Bib.’ ii. 530a) sug-

gests that there is a corruption earlier than any remaining document. We believe that the original reading is represented in the Latin “*ut quid enim Christus, quem adhuc infirmi essemus, secundum tempus pro impiis mortuus est?*” (Vulg. Iren. &c.), and that it ran thus: *ἴwa τι γάρ Χριστός τι ἀσθενῶν ἡμῶν οὐτων κατὰ καιρὸν ἵπερ ἀστεῖῶν ἀπέθανεν*; The position of *τι* indicated by the Latin is confirmed by Epiphanius (Marcion, 369), who quotes the words *τι οὐτων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν*, in this order.

7. Is there any distinction between *ἵπερ δίκαιον* and *ἵπερ τὸν ἄγαθον*?

(i.) The whole context, before and after, has reference to dying for *men*; and the antithesis both to *ἀστεῖῶν* (v. 6) and *ἄμαρτωλῶν* (v. 8), demands the masculine sense here in both adjectives.

(ii.) The first sentence is virtually negative (*μολὼν*), and *δίκαιον* therefore indefinite, and without the article; the affirmative sentence assumes a definite instance marked by the article (*τὸν ἄγαθον*).

(iii.) Is there any distinction or gradation of sense between *δίκαιον* and *ἄγαθος*?

Iren. I. xxvii. 1. *τὸν μὲν δίκαιον, τὸν δὲ ἄγαθὸν ὑπάρχειν.*

Clement. ‘Hom.’ iv. c. 13. *ἄγαθὸν μὲν ὁς μεταπελμένος χαριζόμενον τὰ ἀμαρτηματα, δίκαιον δὲ ὡς ἐκαπτὸ μετὰ τὴν μετανοίαν κατ’ ἀλίαν τῶν πεπραγμένων ἐπεξιώτα.*

Ammonius, *κακὸς πονηρὸν διαφέρει ὥσπερ ὁ ἄκακος τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ.*

Phavorinus, *ἄγαθὸς ὁ τὰ καλὰ χαριζόμενος ἀρβάνος.*

Xenoph. ‘Agesil.’ xi. § 8, *χρήματι γε μὴν οὐ μάρτυν δίκαιως ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐλευθερίως ἔχρητο, τῷ μὲν δίκαιῳ ἀρκεῖν ἥρούμενος εἰν τὰ ἀλλότρια, τῷ δὲ ἐλευθερίῳ καὶ τῶν ἕαντο προσωφρεληγέον εἶναι.*

From these and other passages, adduced by various Commentators, the distinction is clear.

That it is retained in the N. T. see Matt. xx. 15; Lu. xxiii. 50; Rom. vii. 12; Trench, ‘N. T. Synonyms,’ 2nd Series, *ἀγαθωτέν*; Cremer’s ‘Lexicon’ (*ἀγαθός*) and Grimm, ‘Clavis N. T. Philol.’

If, as many think, there is no difference or gradation between *δίκαιον* and *ἄγαθος* in the present passage, its meaning is: “For scarcely for a righteous man will any die: scarcely I say, for perhaps for such a man some one may even dare to die.”

(a) The second sentence is in this case certainly superfluous; for in *μολὼν* “scarcely” with the *improbability*, the *possibility* also is implied.

The needless modification only weakens the previous statement; and Jerome’s admission “pendulo gradu sententiam temperat,”

describes a mode of reasoning very unlike St. Paul's. But if ἀγαθός describes a more generous and attractive quality than δίκαιος, then there is reason for noticing the possible exception: what will *hardly* be done for the man who is merely just, may *perhaps* be done for the good and generous man.

(b) Meyer argues that the Apostle's object is "to make the *character* of the man for whom some one might perhaps make this self-sacrifice, more distinctly felt, for the sake of the contrast:" an argument which tends to prove, not that ἀγαθός is a simple equivalent to δίκαιος, but that it is more forcible and emphatic. Its prominent position at the beginning of the sentence points the same way.

(c) Again, it is urged that δίκαιος cannot mean simply a just, honest, upright man, but must have the wider sense "*righteous*," i.e. righteous before God, as well as before man, because of the contrast with ἀμαρτλῶν, v. 8.

Meyer here falls into confusion, from not observing that in the actual case of Christ's dying for man, ἀμαρτλός, ἐχθρός, and ἀρεβής describe man's character "*coram Deo*:" while in the illustration, where man dies for his fellow man, δίκαιος and ἀγαθός are both limited to human relations, and have their distinct and proper meaning.

8. *died for.*] *I.e.* "in behalf of" ὑπέρ; not "instead of" ἀντί. When David cries, "Would God I had died for thee, O Absalom my son, my son!" (2 Sam. xviii. 33), we find in the LXX ἀντί οὐν. But in fact ἀντί is never used of Christ's *dying for us*, and "in doctrinal passages relating to Christ's death (Gal. iii. 13; Rom. v. 6, 8; xiv. 15; 1 Pet. iii. 18, &c.), it is not justifiable to render ὑπέρ ἡμῶν, and the like, rigorously by '*instead of*' merely on account of such parallel passages as Matt. xx. 28, λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν" (Winer, 'Gr. N. T.', part iii., sect. 47, E. T.)

When Pylades would die for Orestes, or Alcestis for her husband, various prepositions may be used, ἀντί, ὑπέρ, περὶ, πρό: but each has its own proper meaning. For θήσκειν with ὑπέρ, see Eur. 'Alcestis,' 155, 284, 682, 690, 701; with ἀντί, 434, 524, 716. That ἀντί expresses the bare external substitution of one for another, is evident from such passages as the following:—

ἔγώ σε πρεσβεύοντα κάντι τῆς ἔμης  
ψυχῆς κατατήσασα φῶς τόδι εἰσόραν.  
('Alc.' 283.)

σὺ νῦν γενοῦ τοῖσδ' ἀντ' ἐμοῦ μητῆρ τέκνους.  
(ib. 377.)

σὺ τὸν αὐτᾶς ἔτλας πόσιν ἀντὶ σᾶς  
ἀμεῖψαι ψυχῆς ἐξ Αἴδα.  
(ib. 461.)

This proper sense of ἀντί could not possibly be expressed by ὑπέρ; nor can ἀντί

express the sense of ὑπέρ, "on behalf of," "for the good of," derived from its use in the local sense of bending "over" one to protect and defend him. Compare 2 Macc. viii. 21, ἐτούμους ὑπὲρ τῶν νόμων καὶ τῆς πατρίδος ἀποθνήσκειν, also vi. 28; vii. 9; and Ignat. ad Rom. 4, ὑπὲρ Θεοῦ ἀποθνήσκω.

In the passages cited by Raphael on Rom. v. 8, and accepted by Magee as "indisputable" ('Atonement,' i. 245), the idea of substitution is not conveyed by ὑπέρ, but by the context. See especially Xen. 'Anab.' VII. iv. 9.

11. οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα. All modern Editors read καυχώμενοι with R B C D, &c. The reading καυχώμεθα may be due to v. 3, and to the difficulty of finding any regular construction for the Participle, which is still variously explained.

(1) "And not only [as reconciled], but also as those who rejoice in God" (Meyer).

For this view it may be said that the greater the present blessing, the more certain is the future salvation. Now the reconciliation mentioned in verse 10, does not fully express the blessing upon which the believer has already entered, for this includes also a joyful confidence in God.

It is, however, much more simple to refer οὐ μόνον δέ to the principal thought στθησάμεθα.

(2) "And not only [shall be saved], but also saved in such a manner that we shall rejoice in our salvation" (Fritzsche, Godet, Winer, § 45).

In this, as in the former explanation, the sense appears to be sacrificed to the grammar, for it is more natural that καυχώμενοι, like καυχώμεθα in vv. 2, 3, should refer to a present rejoicing.

(3) *And not only [shall be saved], but we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation.*

This is the interpretation of Origen, in Cramer's 'Catena,' and of Theodoret: it admits a slight irregularity of construction, but taints the natural meaning of the passage. ✓

12. For the use of ἐφ' φ in classical authors, see Thuc. i. 113, Polyb. 'Hist.' i. 59, where the future indicative follows; and Xenoph. 'Agesilaus' iv. 1, 'Hellen.' ii. c. 2, § 20, where the infinitive follows.

The present or past indicative seems to be rare; but an example is given by Phavorinus: ἐφ' φ ἀντὶ τοῦ διότι λέγουσιν 'Αττικοὶ μετὰ πνευμάτων διαστολῆς οὖν, ἐφ' φ τὴν κλοπὴν εἰργάσω.

In 2 Cor. v. 4, and in Rom. v. 12, it is well rendered in the Authorised Version "*for that.*"

These two passages are discussed by Photius, Epist. 14 (ed. J. N. Baletta, 1864) τούτου δὴ τὴν διάνοιαν οἱ μὲν “έφ’ φῶ—τῷ Ἀδάμ,” οἱ δὲ “έφ’ φῶ—τῷ θανάτῳ” συνυπακούοντες ἀποδίδοσιν. οὐοὶ δὲ οὐδέτερον δοκεῖ οὐδὲ γάρ τι συνυπακούειν δεῖ, αὐτόθεν ἔχοντος τοῦ ἥρωῦ τὴν ἐντέλειαν τὸ γάρ “έφ’ φῶ πάντες ἡμαρτον” νῦν οὐ προσώπον τυώ, οὐδὲ οὐοὶ προσώπον δεικτικὸν ἔστιν, ἀλλ’ αἵτις μάλιστα παραστατικὸν οὐο, “έφ’ φῶ πάντες ἡμαρτον = διότι πάντες ἡμαρτον.” κ.τ.λ.

In Phil. iii. 12, the only other passage of the

New Testament in which ἔφ’ φῶ is used, the same sense is very suitable. Τέλον. ή τὸ “έφ’ φῶ” “ἐπειδὴ” νύει, ἵνα οὔτως ὅτι διώκω δὲ εἰ καταλάβω, ἐπειδὴ καγώ κατελημόθην.

In all three passages ἔφ’ φῶ seems to be equivalent to ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῷ λόγῳ ὅτι.

That Origen so understood the passage seems probable from his paraphrase of it, ‘Comm. in Evang. Joh.’ tom. xx. § 33: θανάτον εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους διεληλυθότος ἐπὶ τῷ πάντας ἡμαρτηκέναι

## CHAPTER VI.

**I** We may not live in sin, **2** for we are dead unto it, **3** as appeareth by our baptism. **12**

Let not sin reign any more, **18** because we have yielded ourselves to the service of righteousness, **23** and for that death is the wages of sin,

### CHAP. VI.—THE MORAL EFFECTS OF JUSTIFICATION.

The purpose of the chapter is to show that “the righteousness of God” revealed in the Gospel, and described in the preceding chapters, so far from affording any pretext for immorality, is the only sure foundation of practical holiness.

**1.** *What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?]* We have already seen (iii. 8) that the doctrine of justification by faith without works of law was commonly misrepresented by enemies as an encouragement to do evil that good might come; and apart from any such calumny there was some real danger that the doctrine might be abused (Gal. v. 13).

In passing on, therefore, to consider its moral consequences, St. Paul first brings forward, in the form of a question for deliberation, the objection which might be made to his statement in ch. v. 20, 21, concerning the purpose of the law, and its relation to sin and grace.

“*What shall we say then?*” What inference shall we draw for our moral guidance from the fact that, “*where sin multiplied, grace did superabound!*” Are we to continue in sin, in order that God’s “*grace may be multiplied,*” and be more abundantly displayed?

Ἐρμενωμέν, the genuine reading, is the subjunctive of deliberation.

**2.** *God forbid.]* See ch. iii. 4. The thought is first deprecated as impious, and then refuted as absurd.

**W**HAT shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?

**2** God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?

*How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?]* Read, “We that died to sin, how shall we live any longer therein?” The relative clause, placed first for the sake of emphasis, gives a characteristic definition of believers, which shows the absurdity of supposing that they are to “continue in sin.”

The aorist, too, must be properly rendered: “we that died to sin,” not “we that are dead;” for it is a mere truism to say that to live in sin is inconsistent with a continued and present deadness to its influence, and what the Apostle means is that to live in sin is inconsistent with having once died to it. To have shared Christ’s death, in the moral sense, is the sure prelude to sharing His new life. The question “*How?*” implies here not a physical impossibility, but a moral contradiction.

To live in sin means more than to “*continue in sin;*” it is to have sin for the element in which we live, the moral atmosphere which our souls breathe.

The expression “dying unto sin” is first found in this passage, though St. Paul in an earlier epistle speaks of “dying to the law” (Gal. ii. 19; vi. 14; Rom. vii. 4; 1 Pet. ii. 24). It means to be released from all power and influence of sin, as a slave is by death released from the power of his master: see note on v. 7.

Lest the phrase “died to sin” should seem strange and unintelligible, the Apostle checks himself and explains it; yet even in his mode of doing this he implies that his readers ought not to need an explanation.

<sup>1 Or, are.</sup> 3 Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?

4 Therefore we are buried with

him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.

3. *Know ye not?*] “Or know ye not.” The word “or” points to the only alternative: if they do not understand what it is to “have died to sin,” they must be ignorant of the meaning and effect of their baptism; and the very thought of such ignorance gives a tone of reproof to the question.

Here (as in v. 11), instead of “*Jesus Christ*,” the right order is “*Christ Jesus*;” the Mediatorial name holds the emphatic position here, and is used alone in the following context (vv. 4, 8, 9), because He into whom we are baptized is the head, with whom all the members are united in one body.

To be “*baptized into Christ*” is to be brought by baptism into union with Him: but the original word represents this union in a vivid picture, which we can only reproduce by using some less familiar word,—“immersed into Christ,” “immersed into his death.” So the Israelites are said figuratively to have been “all baptized unto (into) Moses in the cloud and in the sea” (1 Cor. x. 2), because the result of their passing under the cloud and through the waters was that “they believed the Lord and his servant Moses” (Ex. xiv. 31), and were thus united with Moses as their deliverer whom they trusted, their leader whom they followed, and their mediator in whose covenant they shared. Compare also 1 Cor. xii. 13, and Gal. iii. 27, in which passages, as here, the union with Christ in baptism is expressly ascribed to all who are baptized, because it is a gift of God bestowed freely on all, though from its very nature dependent on a right use for its continued efficacy.

Christ’s death, burial, and resurrection being necessary steps in the process by which He unites us to Himself in a new life, to be “*baptized into Christ*” is to be brought into union with His death (v. 3), His burial (v. 4), His resurrection (v. 5).

4. *baptized into his death.*] The union with Christ into which we enter by baptism is thus more closely defined first as union with His death; but the death of Christ has various aspects, and the context must determine in which of these it is presented. This is clearly stated in v. 10: “in that he died, he died unto sin once.” His death is here viewed as the final and complete deliverance from a life in which for our sakes He had been subject to conditions imposed by our sins; and this sense exactly corresponds with the thought which led to the mention of Christ’s death, “How

shall we that died to sin, live any longer therein?”

Thus the moral character of the whole life of faith is determined in the very act by which man enters into that life.

4. *Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death.*] “We were buried therefore with him by our baptism into his death.” Assuming his readers’ assent to the fact that “we were baptized into Christ’s death,” St. Paul proceeds to state (1) its immediate consequence, *we were buried with him*, and (2) its final purpose, that we might be, like Him, raised up to a new life.

The expression, “we were buried,” may have been suggested by the momentary burial beneath the baptismal water (see Bingham, ‘Antiq.’ XI. xi. § 4): it declares in the strongest manner our union with Christ in death, and our entire separation from the former life in which sin reigned. But burial, being a sign and seal which attests the reality of death, serves also to attest the reality of the resurrection: hence the significance which St. Paul attaches to Christ’s burial, and to our baptismal burial with Him; compare Col. ii. 12: “buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.”

5. *Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father.*] “Glory” is the manifestation of excellence, and “the glory of the Father” includes all the excellence of Deity that can be manifested: it is a more comprehensive attribute than “power,” which is the kind of excellence especially manifested in the resurrection (ch. i. 4; 1 Cor. vi. 14; 2 Cor. xiii. 4; Eph. i. 19).

Compare our Lord’s words concerning the resurrection of Lazarus: “Said I not unto thee, that, if thou wouldest believe, thou shouldest see the glory of God?” (John xi. 40).

6. *Christ was raised by the glory of the Father,* not as lacking strength Himself, for He is the Lord of all powers, but because both Christ and His Apostles ascribe what is above man’s nature to the glory of the supreme nature” (Cyril in Cramer’s ‘Catena’). So Pearson shows with admirable force that “the raising of Christ is attributed to God the Father, but is not attributed to the Father alone.” See ‘Exposition of the Creed,’ i. 301–304, and note on viii. 11.

By “newness of life” is meant “newness” of

5 For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death,

we shall be also *in the likeness of his resurrection*:

the element of life, of the living animating principle, not the life that is lived day by day (*Bios*), but the life which liveth in us (*ζωή*).

On this most important distinction, see Trench, 'N. T. Syn.', 2nd series, and the comment of Theodorus in Cramer's 'Catena' on this passage, that "we ought to exhibit the conduct proper to that life (*ἐνθείκνυσθαι τὸν Βίον τῆς ζωῆς ἐκείνης*) into which we believe that we have been born through our baptism." The conduct of life (*Bios*) is here expressed by the figure of "walking," as in the similar passage Gal. v. 25. Compare also Eph. v. 2, "walk in love," and Col. iv. 5, "walk in wisdom." The life in Christ is a new life, and this quality is made prominent by the substantive form, "*newness of life*": compare ch. vii. 6; and 1 Tim. vi. 17: Winer, 'Gr.', § xxiv. 2.

The "life" imparted, as is shown in v. 5, is that of the risen Christ in His glorified humanity, of which the Apostle writes to the Colossians (ch. iii. 3, 4), "Ye are dead (*Ye died*), and your life is (has been) hidden with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory."

For an admirable comment on the doctrine of the passage, see Hooker, 'E. P.' B. V. ch. lvi. § 6. "The sons of God have God's own natural Son as a second Adam from heaven, whose race and progeny they are by spiritual and heavenly birth." § 7. "God made Eve of the rib of Adam. And his Church he frameth out of the very flesh, the very wounded and bleeding side of the Son of Man. His body crucified and His blood shed for the life of the world, are the true elements of that heavenly being which maketh us such as Himself is of whom we come."—*Ib.* "Adam is in us as an original cause of our nature, and of that corruption of nature which causes death; Christ as the cause original of restoration to life. . . . Christ having Adam's nature, as we have, but incorrupt, deriveth not nature but incorruption, and that immediately from His own person unto all that belong unto Him."

It will be seen in c. viii. 2, 9-11, that this new vital element is "*the Spirit of life*." In this world the "life" itself is hidden, but its effects are to be seen in our "*walking after the Spirit*" (viii. 4).

5. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death.] "For if we have become united to the likeness of his death."

The death and resurrection of Christ's natural body have their corresponding effects in His mystical body "*the blessed company of*

all faithful people." *The likeness of his death* is their "death unto sin," and *"the likeness of his resurrection"* is their "new birth unto righteousness." These are both included in Baptism, by which the believer has been brought into living union with Christ's mystical body, has become one by birth and growth (*οὐμόντος*) with it and with its essential properties, "*the likeness of his death*" and "*the likeness of his resurrection*."

Some interpreters give a different turn to the passages "if we have been united *with him* by the likeness of his death." But this construction requires an arbitrary addition to St. Paul's words, which do not express, though they of course imply, a direct union of the believer with Christ Himself.

[we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.] The A. V. gives the sense correctly, and it is hardly possible to express in English the lively turn of the Greek (*ἀλλὰ καὶ*): "Why then also of his resurrection we shall be."

"*The likeness of his resurrection*" is the "*newness of life*" imparted to us, as the gift of God, wrought by the same divine power which raised Christ from the dead. "Because the work of his Spirit to those effects" (sanctification and life) "is in us prevented by sin and death possessing us before, it is of necessity that as well our present sanctification unto newness of life, as the future restoration of our bodies should presuppose a participation of the grace, efficacy, merit, or virtue of his body and blood" (Hooker, 'E. P.' lib. v. c. lii. § 10. "It is not required that we should die the death of the body as Christ did, but to die as Isaac did in the similitude and figure of his death; that is, we should die to sin . . . . And as it is not required that we should die the death of the body in Baptism; so it is not to be expected that we should be forthwith raised unto that glory, whereunto He rose, but to (*sic*) be raised unto a similitude or likeness of it, that is, unto newness of life, which is the first resurrection. And of this resurrection we shall not fail to be actual partakers by Baptism, if we be rightly implanted into the similitude of His death; for so the Apostle's words are" (Jackson, 'Creed,' xi. 17).

Thus the future ("we shall be") as in v. 2, is not to be understood of the future resurrection, but expresses that which is morally certain to take place as a consequence of having been united to Christ in his death (see also Alford).

6 Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with *him*, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin.

6. *Knowing this.*] Noting this. The knowledge here meant (*γνῶσκοντες*) is not knowledge of a fact, simply as a fact (*εἰδότες* v. 9), but of the *idea* involved in it, a knowledge which results from the exercise of the understanding (*νοῦς*).

The participle is closely connected with the preceding clause: our conformity to Christ's resurrection must spring from, or at least be attended by, a right perception of the idea and purpose of our union with His death, as stated in what follows.

*our old man is crucified with him.*] This is frequently interpreted as if the whole sinfulness of the unregenerate man, or the whole sinfulness of our common nature derived from Adam, were *personified* under the name of "our old man." But such a figure of speech falls far short of the vivid and intense reality of St. Paul's thought. In Gal. ii. 20, a passage written only a few months before this, he says: "I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me." Contrasting his former with his present state, the Apostle feels that he is like another being, and has undergone a change as complete as that of death; his former self has passed away, he lives as a new man in Christ, and Christ in him. The "old man" is thus seen to be no abstraction or personification, it is our former self in the old corrupt and sinful condition: the figure lies in what follows.

*is crucified with him.*] "Was crucified with him," namely in Baptism, as the whole context requires. If St. Paul's language seems exaggerated, it is because we who were baptized as unconscious infants can hardly realize what Baptism was to the adult believer in the Apostolic age.

"The recipient—thus has St. Paul figuratively represented the process—is conscious (a) in the baptism generally: "Now am I entering into fellowship with the death of Christ;" (b) in the immersion: "Now am I being buried with Christ;" (c) and then in the emergence: "Now I rise to the new life with Christ" (Meyer).

*that the body of sin might be destroyed.*] As it is not "the man" simply, but the "old man" that was crucified, so the purpose of that crucifixion was not that "the body" simply, but "the body of sin" might be destroyed.

7 For he that is dead is freed <sup>from sin.</sup> [Gr. *ελευθερία*.]

8 Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him:

This is the body of the old man that was crucified, that is to say, it is the natural body in its old condition, as the servant of sin.

This relation of servitude is distinctly expressed in the following words, "that we should no longer serve sin," and is fully developed in vv. 12–14, where nothing else than the natural body, and its members can possibly be meant. That which in Col. ii. 11 is called "*the body of the flesh*," because of the allusion to circumcision, is here called "*the body of sin*," because of the reference in this context to sin as a power reigning in the body (v. 21; vi. 1, 2, 12 ff.).

*might be destroyed.*] The body is to be destroyed, not in its material substance, but in its relation to sin: it is to be rendered as thoroughly inert, motionless, and dead, in relation to sin, as it is, by actual crucifixion, in relation to an earthly master. According to our Saviour's emphatic language, the right eye is to be plucked out, and the right hand cut off from the service of sin.

7. *For he that is dead is freed from sin.*] In ver. 6, as in John viii. 34, the sinner is regarded as a servant or slave, who is crucified and dies with Christ, in order that he may no longer be enslaved to sin. This view of the believer's relation to sin is now confirmed by the general maxim that death puts an end to all bondage, and slaves

"once ferried o'er the wave  
That parts us, are emancipate and loos'd."  
(Cowper, 'The Task.'

The only difficulty of the verse is due to the brevity with which St. Paul compresses into one sentence the illustration taken from common life, and its application to our spiritual state. "As the slave when dead is set free from his master, so he that has died with Christ is freed from sin."

The word *δεδικαίωται* does not here mean "justified" in the dogmatic sense, but (as in Sirac. xxvi. 29: *οὐ δικαιωθήσεται κάτηλος ἀπὸ ἀμαρτίας*), "released and emancipated from sin" (Cyril in *Ecumenius*); in Latin, "vindicatus in libertatem."

The context is full of this idea of emancipation from the slavery of sin (vv. 14, 17, 18, 22), and from the power of law (vii. 1–6): and both these ideas are found in like sequence in 1 Cor. vii. 21 and 29.

8–14. The Apostle now turns to a new

9 Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him.

10 For in that he died, he died

unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God.

11 Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but

and peculiar feature of the case: the death, which delivers from the bondage of sin, is followed by a new life of liberty (*vv. 8-11*), which is not under sin's dominion, but is to be devoted to the service of a new master (*vv. 12-14*).

8. Now if we be dead with Christ, &c.] Read, "But if we died with Christ," &c. Since Christ's death has been to Him the prelude to a new life, we who have shared His death believe rightly that we are to share His life also.

That the life here spoken of is a gift bestowed by Christ's grace, is well shown by Calvin on *v. 10*, "If he were only reminding us of a duty, his mode of speaking would have been this: 'Since we have died with Christ, we ought in like manner to live with Him.' But the word 'believe' shows that he is discussing a doctrine of faith, founded upon promises, as if he had said, "Believers ought to hold it certain that by Christ's gift of grace (beneficio), they have so died according to the flesh, that the same Christ maintains the 'newness of life' even unto the end."

The future, "*we shall live*," is not to be limited to the final resurrection, but shows what will necessarily follow, after our participation in Christ's death.

9. Knowing, &c.] Our belief that we shall live with Christ rests on our knowledge of the fact (*εἰδότες*), that He is alive for evermore; we could have no assurance that we shall live with Him, unless we knew that He can never cease to live. Therefore St. Paul repeats the same important truth still more emphatically: "*death bath no more dominion*" (literally, "*is no longer master*") "*over him*." Others who had been raised from the dead returned to that common life of men, in which death still had dominion over them; but with Christ it was not so; "Do not think, because He died once, that He is mortal; for this very reason He abideth immortal. For His death has become the death of Death; and because He died, therefore He dieth no more; for even that death He died unto sin." (Chrysost.)

10. *be died unto sin once*] Christ was subjected for our sake to the power of sin, in so far that He endured all the evils that sin could inflict on one "*who did no sin*." This tyranny of sin (not His own, but ours) was permitted, through the counsel of God and Christ's willing obedience, to compass His

death: "*He bumbld himself and became obedient unto death*" (Phil. ii. 8).

But there sin's power over Him ceased, because the purpose, for which it was permitted, was accomplished. The sin of man, now that it has cost Him His life, can have no more power over Him: He died once for all "*unto sin*," i.e. His previous relation to sin came utterly to an end, He was withdrawn for ever from the power of sin, and therefore from the power of death. There are thus three points to be observed in Christ's relation to sin:

(1) His life, as a conflict with, and a triumph over, sin, making Him as man personally exempt from death.

(2) His voluntary surrender, for the sins of the world, of a life not forfeited by sin of His own.

(3) The effect of this voluntary submission to the chastisement of our sins, viz. His final separation from sin and death. Compare Hebrews vii. 27; ix. 25-28.

*but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God.]* Christ's earthly life was not exclusively a life unto God, but had also a certain relation of subjection to sin; but now the heavenly life "*he liveth unto God*," wholly and exclusively. In Him the manhood taken into God, and perfected by suffering, lives only for its true end, "*the glory of God*." It can, therefore, be no more subject to the usurped tyranny of sin and death: He "*dieth no more*" (*v. 9*).

We should remember that in the words, "*he liveth*," we have the testimony of one who had seen the Lord. In the light that shone round Him by Damascus, he had recognised first a Divine presence, "*Who art thou, Lord?*" and then came the astounding discovery that this living Lord was the persecuted Jesus, which liveth, and was dead, and is alive for evermore.

11. *dead indeed unto sin*.] The word "*dead*" (*νεκρός*) here describes a continued state of death: as Christ died once for all unto sin, so the believer, once united to Christ, must regard himself as dead to the dominion of sin for ever.

*but alive unto God.]* The believer's new life belongs wholly to God, and must be devoted entirely to His service: like Christ, whose life he shares, "*he liveth unto God*" (*v. 10*) a life, which beginning on earth in holiness, shall continue in heaven in glory and honour and immortality.

alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

12 Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof.

<sup>¶Gr.</sup> arms, or, weapons. 13 Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteous-

ness unto sin : but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God.

14 For sin shall not have dominion over you : for ye are not under the law, but under grace.

*through Jesus Christ our Lord.]* Read, “in Christ Jesus.” Conformity to the likeness both of Christ’s death unto sin, and of His life unto God, is to be attained not merely “through,” but “in,” Christ Jesus. It is the proper effect of “*baptism into his death*” (v. 4), but an effect which can only be accomplished in those who realise and appropriate the grace bestowed on them; i.e. who believe and account themselves to be dead unto sin, and alive unto God in Christ Jesus.

12, 13. The exhortation now advances from faith to practice: let your conduct prove that you really are such as you reckon yourselves to be, and that both negatively and positively.

*Let not sin therefore reign.]* Let it no more have dominion ; for we died with Christ that we should no longer be sin’s slaves. “Being called to reign with Christ, it is absurd to choose to become the captives of sin ; as if one should cast off the crown from his head, and wish to be a slave to some demoniac beggar-woman clothed in rags.” (Chrysostom.)

*in your mortal body.]* The Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead, shall hereafter quicken also your mortal body ; but as yet there is in its mortality a remnant or token of past bondage, and you are waiting for its redemption. Compare viii. 11, 23.

*mortal body.]* The only death from which Christ has not redeemed us, is the death—for a time—of the body ; and the fact that the death of the body is still endured by man himself, gives more certainty and prominence to the truth that the death which we have already died in Christ is a death to the power of sin—a moral and sacramental death, which enfranchises our whole nature, body and soul, from sin’s dominion. For though *death still reigns over the mortal body*, the sting of death—which is *sin*—has ceased to reign, except through our own fault.

*that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof.]* Read, with the oldest MSS., “*that ye should obey the lusts thereof,*” i.e. of the body. Lusts of the body there will be: for though the higher part of man—his spirit—is in Christ’s members already alive unto God (viii. 10), the body is still subject to death,

and still exposed to the attacks of sin. See then that sin *reign* not in this mortal part, lest it should extend its usurpation thence to the immortal.

13. *Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin.]* Sin fights for the mastery ; it calls out an army of the lusts of the body, and seeks to use the members, hand, eye, or tongue, as weapons wherewith the lusts may re-establish the rule of unrighteousness. “*Instruments*” (*ὄπλα*) mean weapons of war (John xviii. 3; 2 Cor. x. 4, &c.).

*but yield yourselves unto God.]* The Greek tense is changed : “Do not go on putting your members at sin’s disposal, but once for all present (xii. 1) yourselves, both body and soul, unto God.”

*as those that are alive from the dead.]* A slight omission of superfluous words shows the connexion more clearly : “*yield yourselves unto God as alive from the dead,*” i.e. as men raised to new life in Christ. See Note at end.

*and your members, &c.]* As in the prohibition, so here again in the positive exhortation, the more general thought is followed by the more special : yield yourselves to God, and yield your members as weapons of righteousness unto God.

14. *For sin shall not have dominion over you.]* The exhortation is confirmed by a promise : “Be not discouraged by your own weakness from giving yourselves up to God’s service: your effort shall not fail, ‘for sin shall not be master over you.’ Sin will tempt and harass and ensnare, it will still be a powerful, dangerous, and too often victorious, enemy : but it shall have no authority over you ; it shall not be your lord and master, disposing of you at will, and, as it were, of right” (vi. 9; vii. 1; xiv. 9; 2 Cor. i. 24; 1 Tim. vi. 15).

*for ye are not under the law.]* “*under law.*” As the principle of a covenant of works, law is the strength of sin (1 Cor. xv. 56), and the occasion of its getting the mastery. But you have another Master, who rules not by law, but by grace. Christ Himself was “*made under law*,” in order that by His perfect obedience and atoning death, “*be*

**15** What then? shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid.

**16** Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?

*might redeem them that were under law, that we might receive the adoption of sons* (Gal. iv. 5). In other words, "that we might be brought '*under grace*', and so being freely pardoned, justified, quickened in Christ, and made one with Him, might be no longer servants of sin, but sons of God."

**15. What then?**] Are we to turn the grace of our God into lasciviousness (Jude 4)? Are we to sin in hope of impunity, "*because we are not under law, but under grace?*" "God forbid."

**16.** The suggestion indignantly rejected in **v. 15**, is now refuted by an appeal to truths which cannot be unknown to the reader; first, that he who habitually yields himself up to a slavish obedience, is in fact the slave of him whom he obeys (John viii. 34); and, further, that "*no man can serve two masters*," but must be the servant "*either of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness*." Observe that St. Paul puts the only two alternatives into the sharpest opposition by the aid of particles (*ητοι, η*), which are found nowhere else in the New Testament (see Donaldson's 'Gr. Gr.' § 552).

The end, unto which the servant of sin is brought, is "*death*"; not here bodily death, for that is a result of Adam's sin, from which not even the servants of God are exempt, nor merely moral death, which is sin itself, but eternal death. Compare **vv. 21-23**.

"*Obedience*" is used first in a general sense, but is limited the second time to the special sense of "*obedience to God*," and the end of such obedience is that "*righteousness*," which is equivalent to life eternal (i. 17) and so stands opposed to "*death*."

**17.** The general truth stated in **v. 16**, is now applied to the Christians at Rome in their past and present state, the happy contrast being vividly expressed in a burst of thanksgiving to God: "ardor pectoris apostolici" (Bengel.)

Both the thought and form of expression are similar to Luke xv. 23, "let us eat and be merry, for this my son was dead, and is alive again." Compare Matt. xi. 25, and see Note at end of chapter.

*but ye have obeyed.] "but obeyed."* This

**17** But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine <sup>1 Gr.</sup> *which was delivered* <sub>whereunto  
ye were delivered.</sub>

**18** Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness.

simpler and more exact rendering brings the latter clause into closer connexion with the former, to which it allows its due emphasis. "Thanks be to God for your happy change of service: ye were servants of sin, but became obedient to the Gospel."

St. Paul's thankfulness that they became God's servants, is heightened by the remembrance that they *were* servants of sin.

*from the heart.]* "For ye were not compelled nor forced, but willingly, and with eagerness turned away from sin." This serves at once for praise and for reproof; for, after coming of your own accord, without any compulsion, what forgiveness, what excuse, could you get, for returning to your former state?" (Chrysostom.)

*that form of doctrine which was delivered you.]* "*that form of doctrine unto which ye were delivered*," i.e. by God.

The word *παραδίδων* is not uncommonly used of giving a child over to instruction. (Herodot. i. 73; Plat. 'Legg.' 811 E.)

"*the form of doctrine*" means, in general, the teaching to which the Romans had been given over by Divine Providence on becoming Christians. But the word "*form*" (*τύπος*) has been variously interpreted:

(1) Christian teaching as "a mould into which we are put to be fashioned to its shape." (Beza.)

(2) The Pauline "type of doctrine" (ii. 16; xvi. 25; Gal. ii. 2), which had been prevalent from the first at Rome. (Meyer.)

(3) The Gospel as a definite form of teaching distinct from others, Jewish, heathen, &c.

(4) "*The form of sound words*" (2 Tim. i. 13), or fixed and formal summary of Christian truth in which converts were instructed.

(5) Christian teaching as a rule or pattern of holy living. (Chrysostom, Gennadius, Ecumenius.)

The last sense is the simplest, and agrees best with St. Paul's use of *τύπος* (1 Thess. i. 7; 2 Thess. iii. 9; Phil. iii. 17; 1 Tim. iv. 12; Tit. ii. 7), and with the context, which indicates obedience to moral and practical rules.

**18. Being then made free from sin.]** "And

19 I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh: for as ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness.

*being made free, &c.* This is not a conclusion drawn from vv. 16, 17, but a more precise and pointed statement of the happy change already asserted in v. 17.

19. *I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh.*] The weakness of the flesh is not identical with its sinfulness, for even Christ shared all its weakness. But that which in Him was subject to His Spirit, and free from all sin, in us sinful men not only resists our spirit, but too often prevails over it, and that in two ways, both darkening the understanding and perverting the will. The meaning of the present passage depends on the question, which of these two effects, the moral or the intellectual, is here ascribed to *the infirmity of the flesh.*"

(1) The ancient interpreters, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others, connect this clause with what follows, and understand "*the infirmity of the flesh*" as a *moral* weakness which makes it hard at first to live the life of Christian holiness: "I say what is moderate and within the power of men in general (*ἀνθρώπων*, 1 Cor. x. 13): for I only bid you render such an obedience to righteousness as you formerly gave to sin."

(2) Photius, who is followed by most modern commentators, connects the clause with v. 18, as explaining the strong expression, "*ye were made slaves*" (*εδουλώθητε*): "this is plain language taken from the common life of men, and not altogether an adequate description of your allegiance to Him 'Whose service is perfect freedom:' but I use it '*because of the infirmity of your flesh*' (a), which makes the life of righteousness seem to you at first painful and irksome, as a kind of bondage (Photius), or (b), which is a hindrance to your spiritual discernment. I therefore speak of '*servitude*' (vv. 16-18), a thing belonging to the common life of men, to help you to understand that you are bound to devote yourselves entirely to God's service." In this last interpretation, (which is rightly adopted by Bengel, Meyer, &c.) "*the flesh*," i.e. the condition of the natural man (1 Cor. ii. 14; iii. 1) is the source of a weakness of *understanding* in things spiritual.

On "*the flesh*," see note on vii. 5.

*for as ye have yielded (ye yielded) your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity*

20 For when ye were the servants of sin, ye were free <sup>1</sup>from righteousness. Gr. to righteous ness.

21 What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things is death.

*unto iniquity.*] The practical reason of my speaking about servitude is this, to exhort you to devote yourselves as fully to the life of righteousness as you did to the life of sin.

*your members.*] Compare v. 13. Sin is here presented under a double aspect, as "*uncleanness*" defiling the man, and "*iniquity*" (*ἀνοια*) violating God's law: the subjection of the members to these ruling forces leads to "*unto iniquity*" as the practical result.

*unto holiness.*] "*unto sanctification.*" "*Holiness*" is the moral quality to be acquired: but "*sanctification*" (*διαστομός*) includes the sanctifying act or process, as well as its result; see v. 22; 1 Cor. i. 30; 1 Thess. iv. 3, 4, 7; 2 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Tim. ii. 15; Heb. xii. 14; 1 Pet. i. 2.

20-22. Reason (*γάρ*) for the exhortation of v. 19, drawn from the results of either service.

20. *For when ye were the servants of sin, ye were free from righteousness.*] "*For when ye were servants of sin, ye were free of righteousness:*" i.e. free in relation to, free from the service of righteousness. No irony, but a statement of fact, full of deep moral pain (Meyer). You did not then attempt to serve two masters (comp. v. 16), but gave yourselves wholly to the service of sin. What then was the result (v. 21)? We thus see that v. 20 prepares the way for what follows (Meyer).

21. *What fruit had ye then . . . . ]* "*What fruit therefore had ye then . . . . Therefore,*" i.e. in consequence of this undivided service of sin (v. 20).

*in those things whereof ye are now ashamed.*] We find even in the earliest versions and commentators different ways of connecting this clause with the context.

1. According to A. V., St. Paul asks "*what fruit*," i.e. what profit or reward had you at that time, from things done in the service of sin, at the very thought of which you are now ashamed? You had none: for the end of those things is death. Sin pays no other wages (v. 23), and sin's service has no other fruit.

2. The question is simply, "*what fruit had ye at that time?*" and the answer, "*Things whereof ye are now ashamed, for the end of*

**22** But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life.

them is death." Your only fruit consisted in the sinful gains or pleasures, of which you are now ashamed, because you have become aware of their real nature, that they lead to that death which is the opposite of "everlasting life" (v. 22).

Either interpretation yields a good sense, but the former construction is the more natural and simple.

**22. But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God.]** A double contrast to their former state described in v. 20: emancipated from sin's service, they have been made servants to God. The same strong word as in v. 18 (*δονλωθῆναι*) is used again: but instead of servants "to righteousness," he now says "servants to God," thinking already of Him as the Giver of everlasting life.

*ye have your fruit unto holiness.]* "Unto sanctification;" see note on *ἀγαστός*, v. 19. The first fruit of dedication to God's service is not here described as "sanctification," but as something that tends "unto sanctification." This is either the baptismal grace of "newness of life" (v. 4), or its product, that practice of good works which promotes and establishes "sanctification." Compare "the fruit of the Spirit," Gal. v. 22.

*and the end everlasting life.]* You have your present fruit unto sanctification, and

**23** For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

you have also as the end of your service "everlasting life;" see on ii. 7, v. 21. It is clear that "everlasting life" being here called "the end" is regarded in its future aspect: and yet St. Paul says, "ye have it" now, i.e. ye have it as a future, but assured result, the consummation of your present life in Christ.

**23. For the wages of sin is death.]** "Wages" (*ὑψώνα*) properly, as in Luke iii. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 7; 2 Cor. xi. 8, a soldier's rations or pay. Having spoken in vv. 12, 13, of sin reigning, and of weapons, he continues the figure of military service. But *χάρισμα* means simply "a gift of grace," not a military donative (Tert. 'de Resurrectione Carnis,' 47; Chrys.).

**but the gift of God.]** Sin only pays hard wages, but God gives of His free grace what no service could earn.

**eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.]** "eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord." God's gift of eternal life is not only bestowed through Christ, but is in Christ as its abiding source, and can only be enjoyed in union with Him (see 2 Tim. i. 1, 9, and Note on viii. 1).

The doctrine of sanctification in this chapter, and that of justification in ch. v., both end in the same triumphant conclusion.

#### ADDITIONAL NOTES

on vv. 5, 6, 13, 17, 21.

**5. Σύμφυτος**—born together, Plato, 'Theaet.' p. 157; 'Republ.' X. p. 609, A; 3 Macc. iii. 22; —cognate, kindred, Plato, 'Leges,' x. p. 207.

**6. the body of sin.]** The interpretations are manifold.

1. "The whole mass of sin." But *σῶμα* in the sense of "mass" is applied only to material things, as water or metal (Aristot. Probl. xxiii. 7, § 1, xxiv. 9, § 3), not to things immaterial, as virtue or vice.

2. "The essence, or substance, of sin" (Baur), as Aristotle calls the Enthymeme or *σῶμα*, or substance of rhetorical proof ('Rhet.' I. 1. § 3).

3. A mere periphrasis for "sin" (Photius, Schöttgen, &c.). But in this usage *σῶμα* is applied only to persons and only in poetry. None of these three senses suit the context or St. Paul's usage.

4. "Sin represented as having a body," in

order to carry out the metaphor of the crucifixion of the old man (Olshausen).

5. "Sin represented as a body made up of many members," in accordance with the figurative interpretation of "the old man" (v. 6), and with Col. iii. 5 (but see note there). In this interpretation, "the body of sin" is only another name for "the old man," or rather for its concrete form" (Hodge: so Chrysostom, Philippi, &c.).

6. In opposition to all these figurative interpretations we take "the body of sin" to mean the natural body so far as it is the servant of sin (Meyer, De Wette, Alford).

*Objection (a):* The body as the seat of sin cannot be meant, because this can only be annihilated (*καταργηθῆ*) by natural death.

*Answer (1).* This objection does not apply to "the body as servant of sin," which is here St. Paul's view as shown by *μηκέτι δουλεύειν*.

*Answer (2).* The sense assigned to κα-

*ταργηθῆ* “annihilated” is forced, its true meaning being explained by *τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν*.

*Objection (b).* The following *σῶμα θνητόν* in v. 12, cannot determine the meaning of *σῶμα τῆς ἀμαρτίας*, being found in a different connection.

*Answer.* It is found in precisely the same connection, the *service of sin*.

13. The various reading—*ώσει* for *ώσ*—adopted by Tisch. (8), Tregelles, Lachmann, &c., with A B C, is thus explained by Theodore of Mopsuestia (Cramer's Cat.): “The most marvellous thing is that he says, ‘as if alive from the dead,’ shewing that he does not demand from them the reality, but the imitation, according to their power. For hereafter they will be “alive from the dead;” but now he says, “as (*ώσ*) alive from the dead,” instead of “imitating that as much as possible.”

The variation might easily arise from the scribe repeating part of the following *ἐκ*.

17. Reiche, Fritzsche, Meyer, and others limit the cause of thanksgiving to the words *ἡτε δοῦλοι τῆς ἀμαρτίας*, to which they ascribe the pregnant sense, “ye were, but are no longer, the slaves of sin.”

## CHAPTER VII.

I *No law hath power over a man longer than he liveth.* 4 *But we are dead to the law.*  
7 *Yet is not the law sin,* 12 *but holy, just, good,* 16 *as I acknowledge, who am grieved because I cannot keep it.*

**K**NOW ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the

### CHAP. VII.—DELIVERANCE FROM THE BONDAGE OF LAW AND OF SIN.

1–6. The union of the believer with Christ is compared to a second marriage. This general idea naturally divides itself into three parts: (1) the dissolution of the former marriage; (2) the new marriage; (3) its fruits.

The believer, released from the law by dying in fellowship with the death of Christ, is free to enter into a new union with the risen Christ, in order to bring forth the fruits of holiness to God's honour.

1. *Know ye not?]* Rather, *Or are ye ignorant, brethren, for I am speaking to men that know law.* On the meaning of “know,” i. e. understand (*γνωστούσιν*), see note on vi. 6. “Or,” omitted in A. V. here, as in vi. 3, introduces a necessary

This use of the Substantive Verb is well-known in Latin:

‘Fuius Troes, fuit Ilium et ingens Gloria.’ (Verg. *Aen.* ii. 325.)

‘Magnum manet Ardea nomen, Sed fortuna fuit.’ (vii. 413.)

In Eurip. *Troad.* 582, *πρίν ποτ' ἡμεν* and Hec. 284, *κατήν γάρ ἦν ποτ' ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκ εἴπ' ἔτι*, the cessation of a former state is expressed not by *ἦν*, but by the words which accompany it; and the same is true of this passage, and Eph. v. 8, *ἡτε γάρ ποτε σκότος, νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν Κυπρίῳ*, where the antithetical connection of the clauses is perfectly clear, and the insertion of *μέν* is quite unnecessary, the more so on account of the emphatic position of *ἡτε*. See Jelf, ‘Gr. Gr.’ § 767, 3, and Winer, ii. 652, E. T.

21. *Καρπὸν ἔχειν* may mean to bear fruit, as in v. 1, Nah. iii. 12, *συκαὶ καρποὺς ἔχονται*, Gen. i. 29, *ἔνδον ὁ ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ καρπὸν*, and perhaps Sap. iii. 1, *ἔξει καρπὸν ἐν ἐπισκοπῇ ψυχῶν*.

But this meaning cannot be forced (as by Alford) on St. Paul's use of the expression in i. 13, vi. 21, 22. That *καρπός* does not always mean in N. T. “actions, the fruit of the man considered as the tree,” but the fruit of his actions, is clear from Phil. i. 22, *τοῦτο μοι καρπός ἔργου*.

law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth?

2 For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband.

alternative: either you admit the truth of my assertion, that you are no longer under the law (vi. 14 ff.), but have been set free from sin and become servants to God having your fruit unto holiness (vi. 22), or else you must be ignorant of what I suppose you to know, the nature of law, namely, that the law has power over the person subject to it for his lifetime, and no longer. This principle is not confined to the Mosaic law, either in fact or by the terms here used; yet it is clear, from the whole tenor of the argument, that St. Paul is thinking of the Mosaic law, and assumes that it is known to his readers. Compare Gal. iv. 21.

2. The law of marriage affords the most complete and striking illustration of the general principle that the power of law lasts as long as life lasts, and no longer; it

**3** So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she

also serves to introduce the comparison, in v. 4, of the union between Christ and the believer to a new marriage.

*is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth.*] Rather, *Is bound to the living husband by law* (see 1 Cor. viii. 39).

*loosed.*] “Discharged:” it is most important to mark the identity of the word (*κατίρρυπται*) here rendered “loosed,” and in v. 6 “delivered;” it is found also in Gal. v. 4, where it is vigorously rendered by Wyclif: “ye are voided away from Christ.” On the death of her husband the wife ceases to be a wife; her status as such is abolished and annulled, in the eye of the law; she dies to the law, and is thus discharged from its prohibition of another marriage.

“The law of the husband” means the law concerning the husband. Particular laws are constantly thus defined by the genitive of the person or thing to which they refer, as “the law of the leper” (Lev. xiv. 2), “the law of the Nazarite” (Num. vi. 13). See also Num. v. 29, where the LXX have the same Greek words which St. Paul uses here to describe the wife (*γνωθός γυνι*).

Thus “the law of the husband,” includes all that the law of God, as revealed in the O. T., sanctions or forbids concerning marriage; its natural basis is the original Divine institution (Gen. i. 27; ii. 21-24); its formal enactment is the Seventh Commandment; its interpretation the written, or unwritten, regulations concerning adultery (Lev. x. 10), divorce (Deut. xxiv. 1; Matt. v. 27-32; xix. 3-9), and remarriage (Deut. xxiv. 4; Gen. xxv. 1; Ruth i. 9).

**3. So then if, &c.]** Rather, *So then while her husband liveth she shall be called an adulteress if she be married to another man: but if her husband die, she is free from the law, that she be no adulteress, though she be married to another man.* In this order, the parallelism of the original is clearly seen, and each clause has its due emphasis. The words “that she be no adulteress” express not merely the result, but the purpose, of the freedom consequent upon the husband’s death; and this purpose is the most essential and significant part of the analogy, as we see in the

is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.

**4** Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be

application (v. 4), “*that ye should be married to another.*”

**4. Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead.**] Rather, *So that, my brethren, ye also were put to death to the law through the body of Christ, in order that ye might be married to another.*

“So that” (*ὥστε*) introduces a consequence of that general principle of law, which has just been exemplified in vv. 1-3.

The address “*my brethren,*” repeated so soon after v. 1, is suited to an argument which primarily concerns the Jewish Christians, St. Paul’s brethren according to the flesh.

“*Ye also*” means “*ye as well as the wife in the illustration.*”

The phrase “*were put to death*” (*ἐθαράτωθη*) indicates a violent death, namely the crucifixion of *the old man with Christ* (vi. 6) for thereby the believer himself died to the law, by which he was previously bound. Compare Gal. ii. 19, “*I through law died to law, that I might live unto God. I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.*”

St. Paul’s application of the figure is quite clear, if we follow his own guidance.

The wife represents that inmost self, or personality, which survives all changes, moral or physical, and retains its identity under all conditions of existence.

The first husband is “*our old man*” (vi. 6), and as long as “*the old man*” was alive, we were under the law.

The death of the first husband is the crucifixion of “*our old man*” with Christ. The wife set free by her husband’s death, and herself made dead to the law of the husband (*κατίρρυπται ἀπὸ τοῦ νομοῦ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ*, v. 2), answers to the soul set free by the crucifixion of “*the old man*,” and itself thereby made dead to the law (*ἐθαράτωθη τῷ νομῷ*, v. 4; and *κατηρρύθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νομοῦ*, v. 6).

The purpose of the freedom thus acquired is the same in your case, as in hers, “*that ye might be married to another, to him who was raised from the dead.*”

The interpretation of the passage thus turns upon the recognition of the fact, that St. Paul here already introduces a distinction (which we shall find running through the whole chapter), between *the very self*, the *αὐτὸς ἐγώ*, and its successive moral states,

married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God.

<sup>¶ Gr. pass.</sup> 5 For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by

personified as "the old man," and "the new man."

The words, "through the body of Christ," do not refer to His mystical body, with which we are incorporated, but to the natural body, which was put to death upon the Cross; into that death of Christ we are baptized, and thereby it becomes the means of our death "to the law." Compare note on v. 5, and Col. ii. 14, 20.

This participation in Christ's death has been fully established, and its significance explained, in c. vi. Here, as there, the union in death becomes the source of union in the new life of the risen Christ. The best comment is 2 Cor. v. 14, 15: "If one died for all, then all died: and he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again."

*that ye should be married to another.]* The A.V. "be married" is quite correct: for in the passages usually cited from the LXX (Lev. xxii. 12, 13; Ruth i. 12; Ezek. xxiii. 4) the phrase γίγνεσθαι ἀνδρὶ is applied to marriage, not to promiscuous intercourse. Here also the context limits the meaning to marriage; and the comparison of the union between Christ and the believer to a marriage is familiar to St. Paul (2 Cor. xi. 2; Eph. v. 25, 29).

The purpose of this "spiritual marriage, and unity betwixt Christ and His Church," (and consequently the final purpose of our release from the law), is "that we should bring forth fruit unto God." It is to God's honour, as our Creator, Redeemer, and Lord, that souls wedded to Christ should not remain barren, but be fruitful in good works, in holiness and love.

5. The necessity for the new marriage confirmed by contrasting its fruits with those of the former union.

*When we were in the flesh]* The word "flesh" is used by St. Paul with many different shades of meaning, which are classified in the note on the word σάρξ in the Introduction, § 9. Here as a state in which believers once lived, but live no longer, "the flesh" is regarded, not in its physical but in its ethical quality as opposed to "the spirit," and that, not only as the seat of moral weakness and temptation, to which believers are still subject, but as the sphere of dominant

the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death.

6 But now we are delivered from the law, <sup>Or, being</sup> *that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve that.*

sinful affections to which believers have died in Christ. "When we were in the flesh" is thus equivalent to, "when we were united to our old man," or, "when we were in the body of sin:" compare vi. 6.

*the motions of sins.]* Margin, "the passions of sins" i.e. the passive impressions or "affections" (Gal. v. 24), which are naturally excited by their proper objects, and if unrestrained move us to sinful actions: see Butler's "Analogy," P. I. c. 5, p. 122.

*which were by the law.]* So long as "we were in the flesh," united to "our old man," the law had dominion over us (v. 1). How the sinful passions are occasioned by the law, St. Paul explains in vv. 7, 8.

*did work in our members]* The passive affections of the soul become in their turn motives working on the will, and through it in the members (eye, hand, tongue, &c.), "to bring forth fruit unto death," i.e. to cause us so to act as to subject ourselves to the power of death, death being understood as in vi. 21. Others compare Jas. i. 15, and make the sinful affections themselves bear fruit. See the Additional Note on the word ἐνπνεῖτο at the end of the chapter.

6. *But now we are delivered from the law.]* Rather: *But now we have been discharged from the law:* the Greek word being the same as in v. 2, "She is loosed (discharged) from the law of her husband."

*that being dead, wherein we were held.]* Rather: *by dying to that wherein we were held:* see note at the end.

When "our old man was crucified with Christ," we ourselves, like the wife in the figure, died to the law (v. 4), which had hitherto had dominion over us by virtue of the unhappy union between ourselves and our old sinful nature.

As the Apostle, in girding himself up to the great argument which is to follow (vv. 7-25), has shown in a remarkable allegory by what right and in what manner we are delivered from the dominion of the law, it was natural for him, when indicating here in v. 6 the exact thesis of this most important discussion, to declare, in language derived from the preceding allegory, not only the fact of our liberation from the bondage of the law, but also by what right and reason we are liberated, namely, "by having died to the law in which we were held" (Reiche, 'Comm. Crit.')

in newness of spirit, and not *in the oldness of the letter*.

7 What shall we say then? *Is the law sin?* God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law:

*[that we should serve]* So that we serve: a statement of the actual result, as in vi. 22.

Believers serve God in a new state, the element of which is "spirit," i.e. the life and power imparted to them by the Holy Spirit: this "*newness of spirit*" is the direct and emphatic contrast (Obs. *ob*, not *μή*) to "*oldness of letter*," i.e. the old and obsolete state of bondage to the law regarded in its letter as demanding an obedience which it does not enable us to render. Compare 2 Cor. iii. 6.

This "*oldness of letter*" was necessarily a state productive of sin (v. 5); and this thought forms the point of connection for what follows in v. 7.

#### 7-25. INFLUENCE OF LAW ON THE CONFLICT OF FLESH AND SPIRIT.

Laying aside allegory, St. Paul now enters upon a profound psychological analysis of the work of the law in the heart. This analysis is *based upon his own experience*, as indeed it must be in order to have any truth or value. The use of the first person singular is therefore no rhetorical form, no personification of the human race or of the Jewish people. It is Paul himself speaking of himself throughout: but of himself not as differing from other believers, but as an exemplar and type of what is common to all. He deals, not with what is accidental and peculiar, but with what is essential, so that his experience is recognised by every believer as his own.

The extreme views thus set aside are that (1) only St. Paul's individual experience, (2) only an ideal struggle, is here described. We retain all that is true in these opposite views, in saying either that St. Paul describes his own experience so far as it was essential and common to all, or that he describes the general experience so far as it had been realised in his own case.

7. *Is the law sin?*] Having implied in v. 5 that the law is an *occasion* of sin, St. Paul anticipates a thought that might naturally occur to the mind of a Jewish Christian: Is the law itself sinful? Is the sin, of which it is the occasion, inherent in its own nature? He makes the question more emphatic by using "*sin*" instead of "*sinful*:" see viii. 10, 2 Cor. v. 21.

*Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law.]*

for I had not known 'lust, except <sup>1</sup> Or. con-  
cupiscence the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.

8 But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all

Rather, Nay, sin I knew not, save through law: for of lust also I had no knowledge, if the law had not said, Thou shalt not lust.

To the false notion just rejected, St. Paul now opposes his own experience of the real effect of the law, which is to expose sin in its true nature. The direct opposition is well expressed in A. V. by the emphatic "Nay." Compare iii. 31, vii. 13, xi. 11, in all which passages, as here, *ἀλλα* introduces the contrary notion to that which is rejected in *μη γένοτο*.

"through law." Throughout this passage St. Paul's purpose is to vindicate the Law of Moses (*ὁ νόμος*): yet when he is stating a principle *common to law as law*, he omits the article, as in this clause; compare *vv.* 8, 9, and iii. 20.

The conditional rendering, "*I had not known*," is unnecessary: St. Paul states the fact that he came to know sin as sin, only through the law.

This he confirms (*γινότ*) by further (*τε*) explaining that he had no practical knowledge of lust until the law forbade it, but sin took occasion thereby, and brought about lust. "Even without the law there is desire in man, but not yet in the ethical definite character of *desire after the forbidden*" (Meyer).

The commandment selected is not merely a sample of the rest, but contains a principle that underlies and embraces them all, a principle which, by forbidding the indulgence of desire, provokes a sinful opposition of the will.

Two kinds of knowledge are here expressed by two different Greek Verbs: the former (*γινώσκω*) is applied to the abstract metaphysical notion of *sin*, the latter (*γιδεύω*) to the sensible experience of strong and perverse desire as a fact first brought under observation, when the dormant propensity was roused by the prohibition of the law. The latter verb is often best rendered by "*wist*," as in Luke ii. 49; Joh. v. 13.

8. The mysterious perversity of man's will ("Nititur in vetitum semper, cupimusque negata,") is provoked to opposition by the commandment: an *occasion*, or rather a *start*, and impulse (*ἀφορμή*) is thus given, of which sin, the power lurking unknown in the heart, takes advantage, and works through the commandment to produce every lust which that forbids. See Prov. ix. 17, and note.

manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead.

9 For I was alive without the law

once : but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died.

10 And the commandment, which

*concupiscence.*] Rather “lust” as in v. 7. The introduction in A. V. of different words “lust,” “covet,” “concupiscence,” obscures the clear sense of the original. By “lust” (*επιθυμία*) is meant, not the natural desire in itself, but the perversion of this desire into a conscious opposition to a righteous law.

*For without the law sin was dead.*] Rather, “**For without law sin is dead.**” The statement is expressed in the most general terms as an universal truth, though St. Paul has in view no other application of it, except to the law of Moses. Compare iii. 20, iv. 15, v. 13.

Sin is called “dead,” not as being simply unknown (Aug.), but because, though born with us, it is seemingly still-born, till roused and stimulated into activity. So in Jas. ii. 26, “*faith without works is dead also.*”

9. *For I was alive without the law once.*] Rather, “*But I was alive without law once.*” The emphatic “I” stands out already in contrast to the “sin that dwelleth in me,” v. 20. I was alive, St. Paul means, not only in the full enjoyment of natural life, but in all the freedom of an untroubled conscience.

But when? Not in paradise (Theodoret), nor in the time before Moses (Chrysostom), for St. Paul is not speaking of the human race personified, and therefore not of Adam or the Patriarchs, but of his own experience: nor yet in a pre-existent state (Celsus and Hilgenfeld), of which the Scripture knows nothing. If any definite time is indicated, the Apostle’s thoughts seem to turn back to his early years, with their short dream of

“Delight and liberty, the simple creed  
Of childhood.” (Wordsworth.)

This moral unconsciousness is not limited to childhood: it may pass undisturbed into the form of legal righteousness, as in the rich young ruler, who, when brought face to face with the Commandments, could say, “*All these have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet?*” This seems to have been for a time the case with St. Paul, who tells us that he was “as touching the righteousness that is in the law blameless” (Phil. iii. 6).

*but when the commandment came.*] In this state “without law,” the specific commandment already mentioned in v. 7, “*Thou shalt not lust,*” had not yet presented itself to the individual conscience as a restriction of natural propensity: but when it came as the word of God quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, suddenly all was changed.

*sin revived*] Sin **came to life again**, resuming the active power which properly belongs to it, but had been lying dormant. “*And I died.*” There is a deep tragic pathos in the brief and simple statement: it seems to point to some definite period full of painful recollections. When or how Saul first began to feel the condemning power of the Law, we know not: but in a nature so strong and earnest as his, neither childlike unconsciousness nor untroubled complacency can have been of long continuance. Already in the Pharisee, living according to the strictest sect of his religion, we may discern the intense but unavailing effort to satisfy by outward observance the demands of a holy and heart-searching law. When he became “*a blasphemer, and persecutor, and injurious*” (1 Tim. i. 13), a misguided zeal for God must have been goaded into fury by the sting of an uneasy conscience and the terrors of the Law. Some such desperate moral struggle seems to be intimated, as Philippi suggests, in our Lord’s words, “*It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks*” (Acts xxvi. 14). While the outward fury, and the inward strife were both raging with unabated fierceness, the sudden great light, and the accusing voice, flashed conviction upon the soul and subdued the strong proud will. That was the decisive moment of the struggle upon which the Apostle looks back when he says, “*the commandment came, sin came to life again, and I died.*”

“Sin’s death,” writes Calvin, “is man’s life: conversely sin’s life is man’s death.”

The death which St. Paul here says he had died is to be understood in accordance with ver. 8, “*Sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of lust.*” I thus became consciously and in the fullest sense a sinner, and knew that I had no true life in me (cf. vi. 21, 23): that I was dead in God’s sight, dead in the absence of all power to work righteousness, dead in the consciousness of deserving God’s wrath and condemnation: I knew that there was begun in me a moral and spiritual death, which was a foretaste of eternal death. “With the sense of guilt, the sense of the penalty of death made its appearance: . . . this sense does not distinguish between physical, spiritual, and eternal death.” (Lange.)

10. *And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death.*] “*And the commandment which was unto life, this was found for me to be unto*

*was ordained to life, I found to be unto death.*

11 For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me.

12 Wherefore the law is holy,

and the commandment holy, and just, and good.

13 Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which

*death.*" The commandment was "*unto life*," because it had the promise attached to it, "*that the man which doeth those things shall live by them*" (x. 5). For though external obedience had only a promise of temporal reward ("*days long in the land*," Ex. xx. 12), yet such passages as Lev. xviii. 5, Deut. v. 29, 33, Ez. xx. 11, contain promises which an Israelite of spiritual mind would naturally and rightly expand to meet all the fulness of his desires. In the words, "*The commandment—this was found*," the repetition of the subject increases that tragic emphasis of the sentence on which Chrysostom comments: "He did not say, It has become death, or, It brought forth death, but, It was found; expressing thus the strange and surprising inconsistency."

11. The first words are the same as in v. 8, except that their order is changed: sin as the guilty element is placed foremost, giving emphasis to the thought, "It was sin, *not* the commandment, but sin, that by the commandment deceived and slew me." The emphasis is increased by the repetition of *by the commandment deceived and by it slew me.*"

There is an evident allusion to Gen. iii. 13: "*The serpent beguiled me.*" Compare 2 Cor. xi. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 14.

Sin's deceit consists in presenting the object of desire as *a good*, though when obtained it at once proves to be *an evil*. Compare James i. 14; Eph. iv. 22; Heb. iii. 13.

*slew me.*] Not merely *showed me* that I was in the way to death, but wrought death in me. Compare note on v. 9.

12. *Wherefore.] So that.*" The logical inference from vv. 7–11, is expressed as an actual consequence.

Holiness is first asserted as a characteristic of the whole law, and then more fully and specifically of the commandment, "*Thou shalt not covet;*" because this has been described above as offering an occasion for the increased activity of sin.

The epithets, "*holy, and just, and good,*" are not merely a rhetorical accumulation, meaning that the commandment is altogether good; each word has its appropriate sense in relation to the context.

*The commandment is holy* as an utterance

of God's holy will, forbidding all impure and unholiness. It is "*just*," or righteous, as demanding only an obedience which, if perfectly rendered, would constitute man's righteousness. It is "*good*" in its aim, as tending to man's temporal and eternal good, being ordained "*unto life*" for them that obey it. This interpretation of "*good*," is made certain by the way in which St. Paul explains and vindicates, in v. 13, his assertion that the commandment is "*good*."

13. The Apostle has given, in v. 12, the first side (*αὐτόν*) of an intended contrast between the law and sin; but, instead of completing the antithesis at once ("but sin . . ."), he "goes off" at the word "*good*," to meet an objection which might be urged against the goodness of the commandment, as an inference from his statement in v. 10, "*the commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death.*"

*Was then that which is good made death unto me?*] The answer to this question supplies what was at first intended to form the second part of the contrast between the law (v. 12) and sin: *God forbid! But sin (became death unto me) in order that it might be shown to be sin* (cf. v. 7), *by working death to me through that which is good.*" The Divine purpose in allowing sin to work death through the law is, that sin may exhibit itself in all its hatefulness, in perverting what is good to evil. This purpose is repeated with great force in a parallel clause, which forms an emphatic and solemn close: "*that sin might become exceeding sinful through the commandment.*"

"*Become*" is stronger than "*appear*;" in working death sin becomes in act, and in objective reality, what it has always been according to its nature (see iii. 4, and Meyer thereon).

"Observe the bitter, climactic, sharply and vividly compressed delineation of the gloomy picture" (Meyer). But observe also that God's law is vindicated, and the guilt of man's death rightly fixed on sin; this is the only ray that as yet shines through the darkness. But the light grows stronger in the distinction between "*my true self*," and the "*sin that dwelleth in me*," which forms the subject of the next paragraph.

is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.

14 For we know that the law is

14—25. St. Paul now confirms (*γάρ*) his vindication of the law and exposure of sin by a profound analysis of the operation of sin in man; as his argument in vv. 7—13 was based on the distinction, “not the commandment, but sin taking occasion by the commandment;” so here it is based on the deeper distinction, “Not I, but sin that dwelleth in me.”

“Hitherto he had contrasted himself, in respect of his whole being, with the divine law; now, however, he begins to describe a discord which exists within himself” (Thou-luck).

The true self vindicates the law, even while indwelling sin resists it.

14. *For we know that the law is spiritual.*] “Lest any one should suppose that the law was the cause of these evils, he first puts forward his vindication of it with full force, not only acquitting it of blame, but weaving for it a rich crown of praise. And this he presents not as a favour from himself, but as an expression of general consent; as though he had said, This is an acknowledged and manifest truth, that the law is spiritual, so far from its being the cause of sin.” (Chrysostom.)

Compare ii. 2, iii. 19, for similar appeals to the general religious consciousness of his readers.

St. Paul does not call the law “*spiritual*” simply as being akin to the higher spiritual part of man’s nature—an interpretation wholly forbidden by the direct contrast and opposition in which he presents the law as spiritual, and himself as carnal.

The law is regarded throughout as God’s law—compare vv. 22, 25—and is “*spiritual*,” as being in its essential moral nature, like the spiritual part of man, akin to the Divine Spirit. This is the only meaning that satisfies the context; for it is precisely this Divine spirituality that rouses the opposition of the carnal tendency of man’s nature, though it is approved by the law of the mind (v. 23).

Other interpretations express for the most part, not the exact truth stated by St. Paul, but other truths connected with it as conditions or consequences; e.g., “the law was written by Divine inspiration” (Theodoret). It is “a teacher of virtue, and enemy of vice” (Chrysostom). “It requires a sort of heavenly and angelic righteousness, pure and unblemished” (Calvin). “It requires that every thought of man should answer to God’s thought: and God is a Spirit” (Bengel).

spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin.

15 For that which I do I allow <sup>Gr. know.</sup>

*but I am carnal.]* See Additional Note on *σαρκός*, Introduction, § 9.

According to the reading now generally accepted, the word here rendered “carnal” (*σάρκιος*) does not mean “fleshy” in tendency, but “made of flesh.” The “flesh,” i.e. the unspiritual portion of man, has become so predominant over the rest, that it virtually forms the substance of his whole nature, moral as well as physical: “I am of flesh.”

This is the Pauline mode of expressing, *That which is born of the flesh, is flesh* (John iii. 6). The Pauline expression of “*That which is born of the Spirit is spirit,*” follows in c. viii. (Meyer).

*sold under sin.]* Compare 1 Kings xi. 25. “*Abab, which did sell himself* (LXX was sold) *to work wickedness;*” and Isaiah l. 1, “*Behold for your iniquities have ye sold yourselves* (LXX to your iniquities were ye sold).”

The man is thus described as having been brought under the dominion of sin as completely as a slave under the power of the master to whom he has been sold.

A slave that has been sold is more wretched than a home-born slave; and man is said to have been sold, because he had not been a slave from the beginning (Bengel). Slavery to sin is not the rightful condition of our nature. The reason for using the passive form rather than the active “I have sold myself,” is seen in v. 23.

15—17. The statement, “I am sold under sin,” is now confirmed (*γάρ*) by an explanation of the nature and cause of this moral bondage. The consequent relation of the true self (*έγώ*) to the law is seen in v. 16, and its relation to sin in v. 17.

15. *For that which I do I allow not.]* Rather, *For that which I perform, I know not.* The slave obeys his master without heeding the result of the act which he performs; so “I,” says the Apostle, do not discern the true nature and moral bearing of that which I perform at sin’s bidding. The moral sense is not wholly lost nor inactive, but it is confused and overpowered, and so rendered ineffective. “I am in darkness, I am dragged along, I am abused, I am tripped up, I know not how.” (Chrysostom.)

Calvin rightly prefers the meaning, “I know, I understand, I recognise,” to that which is expressed in A. V., “I allow.” The margin has “I know.” Approval may accompany recognition, but it is never directly expressed by the word here used.

not : for what I would, that do I not ; but what I hate, that do I.

16 If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good.

"For he that is mastered by pleasure, or intoxicated with the passion of anger, has not a clear discernment of the sin. But, after the subsidence of the passion, he receives the perception (*αἰσθησιν*) of the evil." (Theodoret.)

The total suppression of a slave's conscience is well illustrated by such passages as Plautus, 'Capt.' II. i. 6, "Indigna digna habenda sunt, herus qua facit;" Petronius, 'Satyr.' 75, "Non turpe, quod dominus jubet;" Seneca, 'Controv.' iv., "Impudicitia in ingenuo crimen est, in servo necessitas, in liberto officium;" and Pindar, 'Fragm.' 87, σὺν δὲ ἀνίγκᾳ πάν καλόν, his excuse for the female slaves dedicated to the service of Venus Urania at Corinth. See Boissier, 'La Religion romaine,' II. 346, and Allard, 'Les Esclaves chrétiens,' p. 136.

*for what I would, that do I not ; but what I hate, that do I.] For I practise not that which I wish, but what I hate, that I do.* The A. V. obscures the meaning in two ways :

1. By throwing the negative of the former sentence from the first place to the last, and thereby excluding the relative clause from its influence. *Vv. 15-17* describe the course of evil action to which the will does not consent : in ver. 18 we come to the *will to do good* which cannot fulfil itself in act.

2. By using the same word "do" to translate two different Greek verbs, of which the former (*πράσσω*, "ago," Vulg.) implies a conscious pursuit and aim in the person acting, while the latter (*ποιῶ*, "facio," Vulg.) describes merely the outward or objective act, which may be mechanical and unconscious : see i. 32.

Both these verbs refer to the action in its process, while that which is used in the first clause of the verse (*κατεργάζομαι*, "operor," "perficio" v. 18, Vulg.) refers to the completion or result.

A paraphrase may now help to make the Apostle's meaning clearer to the English reader. "I am in bondage under sin ; for like a slave I perform what sin enforces, without recognising the true nature of the act : for I follow not out in practice any good impulse of my will, but in a blind unreasoning way I do that which in my conscience I hate."

The natural conscience even in *beathens* uttered similar declarations :

καὶ μανθάνω μὲν οὐδὲ δρᾶν μέλλω κακό·  
Θυμὸς δὲ κρέσσων τὸν ἐμῷ· Βουλευμάτων,  
(Euripides, 'Medea,' 1074.)

17 Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.

18 For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing : for to will is present with

and—

"Video meliora proboque,  
Deteriora sequor."—Ov. 'Met.' vii.  
(Wordsworth.)

16. *If then I do.]* Rather, "**But if I do:**" a further step in the argument. The emphasis is on "I would not," which expresses a positive unwillingness or dislike, corresponding to "I hate" in v. 15. But why does St. Paul not retain the same phrase, "I hate"? Because the strong utterance of his own vivid experience might not be fully appropriated by all ; and the more measured phrase thus forms a surer, and yet sufficient basis for his inference: if I do evil unwillingly and with dislike, I in my moral will or conscience consent to the law that forbids the evil, and affirm "that it is good." The word rendered "good" (*καλόν*) is not the same as in v. 12 : here it is not the beneficent aim of the law which was ordained unto life, but its moral beauty and excellence that is asserted. Compare note on 1 Pet. ii. 12.

17. *Now then it is no more I that do it.]* "But now it is no more I that perform it." As v. 16 determines the relation in which I as a whole stand to the law, so this verse concludes that the real agent in bringing the evil to completion is not the true "I" (*ἐγώ* expressed) "but the sin that dwelleth in me." Thus the emphatic "I," the true self, the innermost conscience, is distinguished from another "me" in which sin dwells, and which is more closely defined in the next verse as "*my flesh*."

Augustine's words in reference to the struggle between flesh and spirit in the process of his conversion are equally applicable here: "I was myself in both ; but more myself in what I approved, than in what I disapproved," Confess. viii. 5 (Tholuck).

It is now almost universally admitted that the expressions "now," and "no more," are not temporal, distinguishing the speaker's present condition from his former state before grace, but logical: "this being the case ("now"), there is no room left to say it is 1." Compare 1 Cor. xiv. 6; xv. 20; and Rom. vii. 20; xi. 6; Gal. iii. 18 (Lightfoot).

18-20. The power of sin has been shown in vv. 15-17 from the inability of the true self to hinder what it disapproves; the same is shown now from the inability of the true self to carry out into action what it desires.

me; but *how* to perform that which is good I find not.

19 For the good that I would do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do.

20 Now if I do that I would not,

it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.

21 I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me.

22 For I delight in the law of God after the inward man:

The parallelism of the two arguments is marked by the repetition of the same conclusion in the same words in v. 17 and v. 20.

18. *For I know that in me, (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing.]* For I know that there dwelleth not in me, that is in my flesh, any good. A proof of the reality of indwelling sin (v. 17) is furnished by experience of the absence of good: in a moral being, if good dwells not, sin must dwell (Lange).

*for to will is present with me.]* It is essential to a just interpretation of the passage that the Apostle's language concerning the will towards good should be weighed with moderation and candour. He does not use a word expressing the deliberate and final choice which is immediately followed by action (*προαρέτωθαι*, 2 Cor. ix. 7); nor a word expressing a conscious preference and purpose (*βούλομαι*): but θέλω, which simply means "*I am willing*".

The connection, however (especially such a word as *ξυνήδομαι*), implies something more than a cold assent of the understanding. The sense of moral discord has been roused: the inward anguish, so vividly painted in v. 24, could not arise without some emotion of the will, some kind of feeble longing and wishing for good, which yet is very different from the earnest decisive willing which passes at once into action.

*is present with me.]* Lit. "Lies before me," ready at hand. St. Paul takes a survey, as it were, of his equipment for the moral warfare: the will (such as already described) is there present and ready, but the performance not.

*but how to perform that which is good I find not.]* If we omit "*I find*" (*εὑπάκω*) with modern critics, we must render thus: *but not to perform that which is good.*

19. Proof that the will is not accompanied by the power of performance (*τὸ δὲ καρεγύζεσθαι τὸ καλὸν οὐ*, v. 18). This verse, however, is not a mere repetition of v. 15, as the description of the inefficiency of the will is here intensified by a distinct consciousness of the moral nature of the objects presented to it, both of the good that is left undone and of the evil that is done.

20. See notes on v. 17. If the emphatic

έγώ in the first clause is retained, with Tischendorf but not Tregelles, it must be taken with οὐ θέλω. Now if I do that which "I" would not, it is no more "I" that perform it.

21–23. The results of vv. 14–20 are now summed up.

21. *I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me.]* Rather: "I find therefore this law for me who wish to do the good, that to me the evil lies close at hand." 'This law,' literally 'the law,' i. e. the constant rule of experience, that the evil is at hand.

"This experience is very significantly called a "law," because it expresses not an accidental and transient phenomenon, but a necessary and constant one." (Philippi.)

"The law" here meant is substantially the "law in the members" (v. 23), being defined as "the law—that to me the evil lies close at hand." This definition accounts for the use of the Article, and the rule that ὁ νόμος means the Mosaic Law, except where its meaning is otherwise defined by accompanying words, is fully satisfied.

This interpretation is strongly confirmed by v. 22, where "the law," in the usual sense, is called "the law of God," to distinguish it from this other law in man.

The repetition of the emphatic Pronoun, and its unusual position in the first clause (*τὸ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ*), give great prominence to the thought that the self-same "I" is the subject of these opposite experiences, the wish to do good and the intrusion of evil. Compare the words of St. Augustine quoted above on v. 17.

The explanation of *τὸν νόμον* as defined by *δι τ. τ. λ.* is maintained by Cornelius a Lapide, Estius, Calvin, Alford, Weiss in his revised edition of Meyer's Commentary (1881), Godet, and Oltramare.

The A. V. expresses the same general sense, but without due regard to the exact order and construction of the original. See other interpretations of this obscure and much disputed passage in the note at end of chapter.

22, 23. The moral discord just described is now more fully illustrated by a vivid picture of both its opposite elements.

22. *For I delight in the law of God after the inward man.]* The rendering needs no improvement: attempts have been made to

**23** But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into cap-

tivity to the law of sin which is in my members.

**24** O wretched man that I am!

express the meaning of the compound verb more closely: "I rejoice with the law of God" (Meyer); "I rejoice with others in the law" (Van Hengel); "I rejoice with myself in the law;" (Philippi). But these are doubtful and unnecessary refinements, not demanded by the usage of the word: see Eurip. 'Rhesus,' 958, 'Hippolytus,' 1286.

This "delight in the law" differs from "consent," v. 16, as belonging to the sphere of feeling rather than of intellect: it thus expresses a stronger moral sympathy with what is good.

**the inward man.]** It is now admitted by all candid and competent interpreters that this expression is *not in itself* equivalent to "the new man" (Eph. iv. 24, Col. iii. 10), or "new creature" (2 Cor. v. 17, Gal. vi. 15): it indicates the "mind" (*νοῦς*, v. 23 and v. 25), "the spirit of man" (1 Cor. ii. 11) as contrasted with "the outward man," the body or flesh (2 Cor. iv. 16). This "inherent man of the heart" (1 Pet. iii. 4), without which man would not be man, is the spiritual, willing, reasoning being, in which the regenerating power of the Holy Ghost begins to form "the new man," Eph. iii. 16. The context only can decide whether "the inward man" is regarded in his natural or in his regenerate state.

**23. another law.]** Rather, "a different law;" the word (*ἕτερος*) not only distinguishes but often contrasts, as in Gal. i. 6. This other law stands opposed to "the law of God," and "the members" in which it has its seat to "the inward man."

**the law of my mind.]** What he had before called the will to do good, he has here named "the law of the mind;" which law of the mind in its own proper action agrees with and consents unto "the law of God." On the other hand, the impulses (appetites) of the body and the desires of the flesh he calls the "law in the members" (Origen).

The "mind" (*νοῦς*) is here as usually in the N. T. the *moral* reason, the faculty by which good and evil are discerned, the willing as well as the thinking faculty: "when by the divine law man has attained to a consciousness of good and evil, there arises in him a conscious will for the good: . . . the subject of this will is his *νοῦς*." (Delitzsch, 'Biblical Psychology,' p. 212.)

The *νοῦς* is properly an organ of the *νεῦμα*, a part of man's spiritual nature; but in that warfare of which the Apostle speaks it is conquered and taken captive to "the law

of sin that is in the members," and so is termed "the mind of the flesh" (Col. ii. 18).

Some commentators distinguish here four laws. So Origen, Methodius, Ewald, Delitzsch ('Bibl. Psych.', p. 445).

"See," says Photius, in Eusebius, "how we are set round with laws diametrically opposite. For the first pair flow in upon us from without, the one inviting to do good, i.e., the evangelical law (the law of God), the other calling us aside to evil, that is the conflicting law of the wicked one. But the other pair are within and occupy (*στρέψει*) the soul; one the law of the mind implanted in us by the Creator and leading towards the better course, but the fourth, which is also 'the law of sin,' is hardened in us because of the habituation to sin."

This interpretation, and the more recent modifications of it, are inconsistent with St. Paul's expression, "the law of sin which is in my members," the last words of which show beyond all question that "the law of sin" is no other than "the law in the members" above mentioned.

It was necessary to characterise this law according to its true nature, and therefore instead of "bring me into captivity to itself," he has written "to the law of sin which is in my members" (August. 'de Nupt.' i. 30: so Meyer, Philippi, Tholuck, Photius).

The objection of Van Hengel, that the law which leads man captive cannot be the same to which he is made captive, is answered by the very figure employed, a warrior making his enemy a captive to himself.

The variation *ἐν τῷ νοῷ τῆς ἀπάτης*, accepted by Tischendorf and Tregelles on indecisive testimony, makes no greater difference in the sense than "captive in the law" instead of "captive to the law."

**24.** The misery caused by this inward conflict and captivity wrings from the heart a wail of anguish and a cry for help. The question, "Who shall deliver me?" expresses not only eager longing, but also an almost hopeless feeling of the difficulty of finding a deliverer.

**the body of this death.]** The other rendering, "this body of death," destroys the emphasis laid upon the nature of "this death," i.e., of the death which I feel within me, and which I have just described: the desire is not to be released from the body simply as being mortal, but from the body as the seat of this shameful and miserable death of sin (vv. 9-11, 13, 22). See note at end.

*Or, this body of death* who shall deliver me from 'the body of this death ?

25 I thank God through Jesus

The parts of this verse answer closely to the preceding :

"I am a captive. Who shall rescue me ?" "Captive to the law of sin in my members. Who shall deliver me from the body by which I am enslaved to this deadly power of sin ?"

25. *I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord.*] "Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord." This is to be preferred as both the shortest reading (*xápis* instead of *εὐχαριστῶ*, or *ἡ xápis τοῦ Θεοῦ*), and the one which best explains the origin of the others : see note at end.

The language is abrupt, and the sense incompletely expressed, no direct answer being given to the question, "*Who shall deliver me ?*" This abruptness is, however, in itself a proof of genuineness, answering as it does most naturally to the outburst of anguish in v. 24, and to the sudden revulsion of feeling with which the Apostle turns to view his actual present state in contrast to his former misery.

The cause of thankfulness is not expressed, which is "quite after the manner of lively emotion" (Meyer); but a thanksgiving offered to God "through Jesus Christ" implies that He is the author of the redemption so vehemently desired.

*So then with the mind I myself, &c.*] It is better to keep the order of the original, which puts an emphasis on *avtōs éγώ*, "So then I myself with the mind," &c. If Christ is my deliverer, it is implied that "I myself" without Christ cannot get beyond

Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God ; but with the flesh the law of sin.

the state of distraction and self-contradiction already described in vv. 14-23. This inference from the immediate context (*āpa oīv*) is thus at the same time a summary recapitulation of the whole passage. "*The law of God*" and "*the law of sin*" have both been mentioned above in vv. 22, 23, each with its article : here the articles are omitted in order to bring out more clearly *what each law* is in its nature and quality, the one "*a law of God*," the other "*a law of sin*."

The proposal of Lachmann, Van Hengel, and others to transfer this latter part of v. 25, and put it immediately after v. 23 is against all authority, and would destroy the proper sense of *avtōs éγώ*, which is only brought out by contrast with *διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*.

With the proposed transfer, the process of the Apostle's thoughts would be strictly correct and logical, but how tame in comparison with the sudden outburst of emotion expressed in the actual text ! At the crisis reached in v. 23 there is first an irrepressible burst of anguish, and then a sudden revulsion of thanksgiving as the Apostle for a moment breaks away from the miserable past to the happy present, and then in the close of the verse returns more calmly to the general conclusion of his long description.

It is a much disputed question whether St. Paul in this chapter describes the conflicts of an unregenerate or of a regenerate man. The true answer is given by Dean Jackson (ix. 52) in two words, "*inter regenerandum*," "*in the process of regeneration.*"

#### ADDITIONAL NOTES on vv. 1, 5, 6, 21, 25.

1. *ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ.* Hofmann is right in maintaining against Meyer that the emphasis of thought (as of position) is on *ζῇ*, and appealing in proof to v. 2, *τῷ ζῶντι ἀνθρῷ*. See also v. 3, *ζῶντος*.

Meyer tries to defend his view by urging that "the very expression *ὅσον* shows that the emphasis is on *ἐφ'* *ὅσον χρόνον*, meaning 'all the time that,'" but this is hypercritical and erroneous.

The fuller thought, "so long as he liveth and no longer," far from being utterly irrelevant, is absolutely required. St. Paul's contention is not merely that the Jew, as such, was bound by the law all his life, but more particularly that by death he was set free from it.

This is clear also from vi. 7, "*For he that is dead is freed from sin.*"

5. *Παθήματα* in this ethical sense occurs in the N. T. only here and in Gal. v. 24.

It is used by Plato (e.g. 'Phædo,' 79 D: *καὶ τοῦτο τὸ πάθημα φρόνσις καλεῖται*) and Aristotle ('Eth. Eudem.' II. ii. 2, 3: *κατὰ τὴν δυνάμεις τῶν παθημάτων καθ' ἄσ παθητικού λέγονται, καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἔξεις, καθ' ἄσ πρὸς τὰ πάθη ταῦτα λέγονται τῷ [ητο?] πάσχειν τὸς ἡ ἀπαθεῖς εἶναι*), indifferently of all emotions, and as equivalent to *πάθος*, though this latter word is more commonly applied to evil affections : compare Rom. i. 26; Col. iii. 5; 1 Thess. iv. 5.

*Ἐνηργεῖτο.* See Aristot. 'Eth. Eud.' II. ii. 1,

where he shows that *ἥθος*, which grows out of *ἥθος*, is acquired by being often moved in a certain way, and so at length the energy or active *ἥθος*, *rō ἐνεργητικόν*, is formed.

Chrysostom takes *ἐνηργέτῳ* in a Passive sense, “were wrought in our members,” as showing that “the evil is derived from another source, from the thoughts that work, not from the members that are wrought upon.”

The Passive occurs in Polybius, I. xiii. 5; IX. xii. 3, 7: xiii. 9; Jos. Ant. Jud. lib. XV. c. v. § 3, l. 40, Dindorf: in all which passages it is used of the operations carried on in war.

A careful consideration of all the examples in the N. T. (1 Thess. ii. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 7; 2 Cor. i. 6; iv. 12; Gal. v. 6; Eph. iii. 20; Col. i. 29; Jas. v. 16) seems to show that the Middle sense is everywhere preferable to the Passive.

The Active voice is used of an external or independent agent; the Middle, of a power already belonging to the Subject in whom it works.

6. The A. V. is formed on the reading *ἀποθανόντος*, which has no MS. authority, but was introduced into the printed text by Beza, who erroneously inferred from the comment of Chrysostom that he had that reading before him.

*τὸν θανάτον* is the reading found in the Greek-Latin uncials D E F G, in the Latin Versions It. and Vulg. (exc. Codex Amiatinus “morientes”), in the Latin Fathers, and in copies mentioned by Origen (or Rufinus), who, however preferred *ἀποθανόντες*, “sed hoc id est, *mortuī* est verius et rectius.” Meyer rightly regards it as “a gloss, having a practical bearing on *τὸν νόμον*, which has dispensed the participle regarded as disturbing the construction.” Reiche thinks *τὸν θανάτον* was substituted for *ἀποθανόντες*, as supplying an easy reference for *ἐν φ.*

*ἀποθανόντες* has a superabundant weight of authority (Reiche), and is confirmed by the peculiarity of the construction, *ἀποθανόντες ἐν ω κατειχόμεθα*, which is difficult, but by no means to be rejected as either contrary to Greek usage or void of a suitable sense. It has been variously rendered.

(a) *We have been discharged by death from the law wherein we were held*: Riickert, De Wette, &c. This rendering gives excellent sense, but is forbidden by the position of *ἀποθανόντες*.

(b) *We have been discharged from the law by dying in that wherein we were held, i.e. in our old man* (Forbes). This, too, gives a good sense, but there is nothing in the immediate context to suggest that the antecedent to be supplied is “our old man.”

(c) *We have been discharged from the law by dying in him in whom we were held, i.e. in Christ.*

This construction has no support in the immediate context, and the meaning attributed to *κατειχόμεθα* is unusual and inadmissible.

(d) *We have been discharged from the law by dying unto that wherein we were held, i.e. to the law, in whose grasp we were.*

This last construction, which gives the same sense as (a), is adopted by Meyer, Reiche, &c., and is much to be preferred. It states in accordance with the preceding allegory the mode in which we were released from the law, namely by dying to it.

21. This passage is regarded by Chrysostom and other Greek Fathers as “a dark saying,” and is given up by some modern commentators as hopelessly unintelligible. These interpreters, both ancient and modern, have in fact made for themselves an insuperable stumbling-block, by insisting that *τὸν νόμον* must mean the Mosaic Law. It will be sufficient to give a few specimens of the explanations thus attempted, which for the most part refute themselves.

(a) Chrysostom and the Greek commentators generally, instead of interpreting the passage, almost rewrite it with unwarrantable additions: “I find the law *helping and encouraging* me, who wish to do good, but *am in want of help*, because evil is present with me.”

(b) Fritzsche and others govern *τὸν νόμον*, not by *εἰρίσκω* but by *ποιεῖν*, and make “the law” identical with “the good”: “I find that to me *who wish to do the law, that is the good, evil is present.*”

(c) Ewald, on the contrary, identifies “the law” with “the evil”: “I find therefore that the law, when I desire to do the good, *lies at hand to me as the evil.*”

(d) New complications are introduced by Meyer:

“*Τὸν νόμον* is to be understood of the Mosaic Law, and joined with *τῷ θεῖοντι*, *ποιεῖν* is to be taken as Infinitive of the purpose (Buttmann, *neut. Gr.*, p. 224), and *ἐπικ. τ. λ.* as object of *εἰρίσκω* (*comp. Est. ii. 26*): *it results to me, therefore, that, while my will is directed to the law, in order to do the good, the evil lies before me.*”

While Meyer justly terms other views, which he rejects, “forced expedients,” and “tortuous explanations,” he is surprised that his own interpretation should be regarded as “harsh” (Delitzsch), “forced” (Philippi), “strange and meaningless” (Hofmann).

25. The variation in the readings is instructive:

(1) *χάρις τῷ θεῷ* B Thebaic.  
(2) *χ. δὲ τῷ θεῷ* N<sup>o</sup> C<sup>2</sup>, some cursives Memphitic.

(3) *ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ* D E, d e, v g.

(4) ἡ χ. τοῦ κυρίου F G, t.g.

(5) εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ N\*AKLP, cursives, Syriac.

The excellence of the Vatican Codex (B) is here conspicuous. Its reading, though apparently found in no other known manuscript, and supported only by one version,

and a few citations in the Fathers, is unquestionably genuine: it alone explains all the others. For example, the reading of the Textus Receptus (*εὐχαριστῶ*) may be readily traced to a combination of *χάρις* with the syllables which precede and follow it in the original reading (*οὐχαριστῶ*).

## CHAPTER VIII.

**1** *They that are in Christ, and live according to the Spirit, are free from condemnation.*  
**5, 13** *What harm cometh of the flesh, 6, 14 and what good of the Spirit: 17 and what of being God's child, 19 whose glorious deliverance all things long for, 29 was beforehand decreed from God. 38 What can sever us from his love?*

CHAP. VIII. NATURE OF THE DELIVERANCE ANTICIPATED IN ST. PAUL'S TRIUMPHANT THANKSGIVING IN VII. 25.

**1-11.** Condemnation under “*the law of sin and death*” is abolished by “*the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus*.”

**1. therefore]** An inference from the thanksgiving in vii. 25, as is shown by the word “*now*,” meaning “*now that a deliverer has been found in Christ Jesus, like the “now” in vii. 6.*

This connection is made certain by **v. 2**, which expressly asserts the deliverance as the cause why “*there is now no condemnation*.”

*to them which are in Christ Jesus.]* “To be in Christ” does not mean in St. Paul’s writings “to be dependent on Christ” (a common classical usage), nor merely (as Fritzsche tries to prove) to be His follower or disciple, as Pythagoreans or Platonists were followers of their several masters. It implies that living union which Christ Himself first made known: “*Because I live, ye shall live also. At that day, ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in Me, and I in you*” (John xv. 19, 20: compare John xv. 4-7).

This union with Christ is frequently described by St. John as “*being in Him*”: 1 John ii. 5, 6, 24, 28; iii. 24; v. 20.

The same expression is found in 1 Pet. iii. 16; v. 10, 14; but is especially characteristic of St. Paul’s writings, being applied by him both to churches (Gal. i. 22; 1 Thess. i. 1; ii. 14; iv. 16; 2 Thess. i. 1) and to individuals (1 Cor. i. 30; 2 Cor. v. 17; Eph. i. 1; ii. 10, &c.). What St. Paul affirmed at Athens of all mankind in their natural relation to God, that “*in Him we live and move and have our being*” (Acts xvii. 28), he applies in a higher sense to the spiritual union of believers with

**T**HREE is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

**2** For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death.

Christ. In Gal. iii. 26-28, we see both the inward and outward means of this union, namely, faith and baptism.

In speaking of this union, St. Paul never uses the name “Jesus” alone nor first, but gives prominence to the Divine dignity and saving power of “Christ” (Van Hengel).

“It is a point not of opinion, but of belief, that the Son of God did take our nature upon Him, not only to the end that He might lay it down for our ransom, or suffer for us in the flesh, but to the end withal that, having suffered for us according to His humanity, He might by it *unite us unto Himself as He is God* in a more peculiar manner than our human nature without such union to His human nature was capable of” (Jackson, ‘On the Creed,’ b. xii.).

This union is represented under various figures as that of the vine and its branches, the foundation and the building, the head and the members: in this passage the context (**v. 2** compared with vii. 4, 6, 25) suggests “*the spiritual marriage and unity betwixt Christ and His Church*.”

The words, “*who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit*,” are rejected by all critics as a gloss brought from **v. 4**. The interpolation is of very early date.

**2. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and of death.]** “*The law of sin and of death*” from which man is set free must clearly be that to which he has been previously in captivity, namely, “*the law of sin in the members*” (vii. 23), which is also a law of death, as already implied in vii. 11.

This being a power within the man, the law which is opposed to it, and overpowers it, must also be an inward power. Thus “*the law of the Spirit of life*” is not the Gospel, nor its plan of salvation, neither is it “*the*

**3** For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own

Son in the likeness of sinful flesh,  
and <sup>1</sup>for sin, condemned sin in the <sup>1 Or, by a  
sacrifice for sin.</sup>

*law of the mind*" (vii. 23), which has been already proved powerless against the flesh; but it is the life-giving power of the Holy Ghost, ruling as a law in the heart.

"*The Spirit of life*" is so called, because He is the Author and Giver of life: compare v. 11; John vi. 63; 1 Cor. xv. 45; 2 Cor. iii. 6. The genitive expresses the effect wrought, as in John vi. 35, "*the bread of life*," and Rom. v. 18, "*justification of life*."

From "*the Spirit of life*" dwelling in the inner man goes forth a power which not only commands as a law, but also quickens and inspires obedience as a living and life-giving law, and thus sets the man free from the contrary "*law of sin and of death*."

This deliverance was first effected in the Person of Christ, as is shown in v. 3, and can be continued only "*in Christ Jesus*," i.e., "in fellowship of life with Him, in being and living in Him, v. 1" (Meyer).

The verb stands between two prepositional clauses, both dependent on it: "*in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death*." The same arrangement is found also in i. 17, iii. 7, v. 17, the clause with *ēv* being placed, as here, before the verb: an emphasis is thus thrown on the words "*in Christ Jesus*," as in 1 Cor. iv. 15; Gal. v. 6.

**3.** To confirm the truth stated in v. 2, St. Paul now declares the actual method by which the liberation from the law of sin and of death is effected; and first he enhances the greatness of the task, as being that which the law of Moses had not power to accomplish.

*For what the law could not do.*] On the construction, see Note at end: the sense is clearly given in the A. V.: "*what the law could not do*," is what God did by other means, i.e., "*condemned sin in the flesh*."

The law could not do this, "*in that it was weak through the flesh*,"—a cause of failure already explained in vii. 14–25.

*God sending his own Son.*] After showing exactly wherein the difficulty lay which the law had not power to overcome, the Apostle proceeds to declare how God overcame it.

The language is remarkable: the emphatic words, "*His own Son*," implying the fulness of Divine power in the Son of God, stand in striking contrast between the impotence of the Law and the weakness of Christ's human nature.

*in the likeness of sinful flesh.*] **In likeness of the flesh of sin.**

**The flesh of sin** describes man's animal nature as having become the seat of indwelling sin. But of that nature itself sin is no part nor

property, only its fault and corruption. Hence Christ could take true human flesh, "of the substance of the Virgin Mary His Mother," without that quality of sinfulness which it has acquired in us, who are "naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam." "In putting on our flesh He made it His own: in making it His own, He made it sinless" (Tertullian, *De Carne Christi*, c. 16). Christ thus was sent "*in likeness of sinful flesh*," not as if He had taken on Him the "likeness of flesh" in the sense of a semblance of body instead of its reality: but St. Paul means us to understand likeness to the flesh which sinned, because the flesh of Christ, which committed no sin itself, was like that which had sinned, like it in its nature, but not in the corruption it received from Adam: whence we also affirm that there was in Christ the same flesh as that whose nature in man is sinful (Tertull. ib.). (See Additional Note.)

*and for sin.*] The words might also be rendered: "and as a sin-offering," being so used in the Septuagint, Lev. iv. 33; v. 6, 7, 8, 9; vii. 37; and Ps. xl. 6, and in Heb. x. 6, 8. Here, however, an exclusive reference to sacrifice is not permitted by the context, which refers, not only to the expiation, but also to the practical condemnation and destruction of sin (v. 4). The more comprehensive meaning "*for sin*" (i.e. "on account of" or "concerning sin") is therefore to be preferred here, and is found in A. V. even in Heb. xiii. 11, where the context expressly limits the meaning to "sacrifice for sin."

*condemned sin in the flesh.*] The rendering "*in his flesh*," i.e. Christ's, is not admissible; for the flesh has already been twice identified in this verse with the "flesh of sin," i.e. the flesh in which sin exercises its usurped dominion. How then did God *condemn sin in the flesh*, i.e., in human nature generally? (1) By exhibiting in the person of His Incarnate Son the same flesh in substance but free from sin, He proved that sin was *in the flesh* only as an unnatural and usurping tyrant. Thus the manifestation of Christ in sinless humanity at once condemned sin in principle. For this sense of *katakipō*, to condemn by contrast, see Matt. xii. 41, 42, and Heb. xi. 7.

But (2) God condemned sin practically and effectively by destroying its power and casting it out; and this is the sense especially required by the context. The law could condemn sin only in word, and could not make its condemnation effectual. Christ coming "*for sin*" not only made atonement

4 That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

for it by His Death, but uniting man to Himself “*in newness of life*” (vi. 4), gave actual effect to the condemnation of sin by destroying its dominion “*in the flesh*” through the life-giving sanctifying power of His Spirit.

4. The purpose for which God condemned sin in the flesh.

*That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us.]* “*That the righteous demand of the law,*” &c.,—i.e. what it demands as right.

The one righteous demand of the law which includes all its other demands (*rā δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου*, ii. 26; Luke i. 6; Numbers xxxi. 21, is holy obedience inspired by the love of God (Luke x. 27). That this “*righteous demand of the law might be fulfilled in us,*” was the great final cause of God’s sending His Son into the world.

Other interpretations of the passage may be classified according to the meanings assigned to *δικαιώμα*.

(1) “The righteous sentence of the law” in condemnation of sin (i. 32).

This is contrary to the tenor of the passage, and to the plain meaning of the words “*fulfilled in us*”: for as to the condemnatory sentence of the law, God’s purpose in sending His Son was that it might not be fulfilled in us.

(2) The justification, or justifying sentence of the law (v. 16). Fritzsche refers this to the promise (Lev. xviii. 5, Deut. v. 33) that the man who keeps the commandments of God shall find life therein.

But “*justification*” is not and cannot be ascribed to the law (iii. 20; Gal. iii. 11, 21; Acts xiii. 39): “it is God that justifieth.” Accordingly *δικαιώμα* in this sense is not found with *νόμου*.

(3) The righteousness or right conduct corresponding to the law’s demand (v. 18; Apoc. xix. 8).

In this sense also *δικαιώμα* is not found in combination with *νόμου*: and if such usage were established, the general meaning of the passage would be the same as that which we have given above; for the righteousness which satisfies the law is the counterpart of the law’s righteous demand.

It may be well to gather up the fragments of truth which underlie these various interpretations.

Christ came indeed that the law’s “righteous sentence” of condemnation against sin might be fulfilled, *not in us*, but in His atoning death. He came, that “the justifying sentence,” *not of the law*, but of God,

5 For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit.

might be ratified and accomplished upon all who believe in Him. He came also “*to fulfil all righteousness*” in His own Person: not only to give us an example of perfect obedience to the law, but also to redeem us from the curse of the law, and further to “condemn sin in the flesh” by showing that it has not a rightful but only an usurped dominion there, and so to deliver our whole nature, body, soul, and spirit from sin’s bondage, and then lastly so to make us one with Himself in this renewed nature, that through the quickening and sanctifying power of His Spirit we also may “*walk in newness of life*” (vi. 4), in other words “*that the righteousness of the law (its demand of holiness) may be fulfilled in us.*”

There is no force in Calvin’s objection, that believers renewed by the Spirit do not in fact attain in this life to such proficiency in holiness, that the righteousness of the Law is fulfilled in them: for God’s purpose, of which St. Paul is here speaking, is clearly affirmed in such passages as Eph. ii. 10, Col. ii. 10. Compare xiii. 8; Gal. v. 14.

This interpretation is placed beyond doubt by the additional clause which defines the character of those in whom the righteous requirement of the law is to be fulfilled; namely such as “*walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit;*” this character is determined by the ruling principle according to which their actual life is regulated. They “*walk not after the flesh,*” for the flesh with its affections and lusts rebels against the law, “*but after the Spirit.*” *“The Spirit,”* being here regarded as the regulating principle (*kárdi*), cannot be man’s own spirit however renewed and sanctified, but the Divine power itself which renews and sanctifies, i.e. the indwelling Spirit of God, as in v. 9.

5. For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh.] “To be after the flesh” is to have the flesh for the ruling principle of our being: “*to walk after the flesh*” (v. 4) is to follow this principle in the actual life. The distinction is not meant to be made prominent; but it is necessary to go back from the outward symptom to the cause, in order to derive from that the intermediate process: “*they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh,*” and so “*walk after the flesh.*”

“*The things of the flesh*” are opposed to “*the things of the Spirit;*”—

(1) as human to divine,—“*Thou savourest (literally mindest) not the things that be of*

I Gr. the  
minding  
of the  
flesh.  
¶ Gr. the  
minding  
of the  
Spirit.  
¶ Gr. the  
minding  
of the  
flesh.

6 For <sup>to be carnally minded is</sup> death; but <sup>to be spiritually minded is</sup> life and peace.

7 Because <sup>the carnal mind is enmity against God:</sup> for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.

*God, but those that be of men* (Matt. xvi. 23); (2) as earthly things to heavenly (Phil. iii. 19, Col. iii. 2), and (3) in utter moral contradiction, as sin to holiness (Gal. v. 19–21; 22, 23).

6. The definition of those in whom the righteousness of the law is to be fulfilled (v. 4) is justified and confirmed both on its negative and positive sides by the reason stated in v. 3, which reason is itself confirmed by a further development in v. 6, and that again is explained on the negative side in v. 7.

*to be carnally minded.]* “The lust of the flesh, called in the Greek φρόντια σαρκός, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire, of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God” (Art. ix.). The A. V. is a fair paraphrase of the literal meaning “mind of the flesh,” in which “mind” (or “minding” Marg.) means “thought,” “purpose,” “sentiment,” or “study,” as in viii. 27, “God knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit.”

“**The flesh**” is not the mere material of the body, but “the infection of nature” (Art. ix.). Compare Delitzsch, ‘Biblical Psychology,’ pp. 439, 442, and Additional Note on σάρξ, Introduction, § 9. The statement that “**the mind of the flesh is death**” is explained by St. Paul himself in v. 7: for “enmity against God,” separating man from the only source of life, not only leads to death, but is itself the very essence of death, so that the sinner is dead while he liveth (1 Tim. v. 6).

*but to be spiritually minded is life and peace.]* “but the mind of the Spirit is life and peace.” Meyer’s explanation that “the striving of the Holy Spirit tends to lead man to eternal life and blessedness” is inadequate. “**The mind of the Spirit,**” the whole state of thought and feeling which proceeds from the Spirit, dwelling in man’s heart (v. 9), “is life,” the true life of the soul, the first-fruit of that gift of God which is eternal life (vi. 23).

“**Peace**” is not here the act of reconciliation wrought by Christ’s death (v. 1), but the conscious enjoyment of that reconciliation, the holy calm breathed over the soul by the

8 So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God.

9 But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.

Holy Ghost pouring forth God’s love upon the heart. See note on v. 5.

7, 8. St. Paul now follows out separately the proof of the former part of v. 6, “**the mind of the flesh is death;**” his argument is explained in the note on that clause. By adding the word “*peace*” to “*life*” in v. 6, he has already prepared the way for passing over to the mention of that “*enmity*” which is “*death*” (Bengel). The proof that “**the mind of the flesh is enmity against God**” is seen in the fact that “*it is not subject to the law of God;*” and this fact of experience, (fully established in c. vii.) is further traced to its inmost cause in the depraved tendency of “*the mind of the flesh;*” “*for it doth not submit itself to the law of God, for indeed it cannot.*” “He does not say that it is impossible for the wicked man to become good, but that it is impossible for him remaining wicked to submit to God: by conversion, however, it is easy to become good and submit.” (Chrysostom.)

8. *So then.]* “**And**” (δέ): the particle marks “the continuation under a slightly changed form” (Bp. Ellicott) of the opening statement of v. 7: “*Because the mind of the flesh is enmity against God . . . and they that are in the flesh cannot please God.*” From the abstract principle he passes to its practical result.

9. *But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit.]* Personal application to the readers of the general statements of vv. 5–8. “*Ye*” is emphatic.

“**The flesh**” and “**the Spirit**,” represented in v. 5 as ruling principles, according to which men’s moral life is regulated, here appear as opposite elements, in one or other of which that life subsists.

*if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you.]* It is characteristic of St. Paul that he first expresses his strong and loving confidence in his readers in the absolute assertion, “*Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit.*” and then, remembering that so unqualified a statement could not safely be applied to all, he adds, by way of caution, and stimulus to self-examination, the condition upon which his statement concerning them necessarily depends, a “*conditio sine qua non.*”

10 And if Christ *be* in you, the body *is* dead because of sin; but the

Spirit *is* life because of righteousness.

"For the Spirit of God must dwell in the man in order that He may be the determining element in which the man lives;" compare St. John's expression "*Ye in me, and I in you*" (Meyer). For the conditional "dwell" read "dwelleth;" see note at end.

*Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ.]* "But if any man hath not," &c.

The favourable supposition, "*if the Spirit of God dwelleth in you,*" was applied to the readers generally: but on the unfavourable side St. Paul puts only the supposition that this or that man among them *hath not the Spirit of Christ.*" It is clear from the connection that "*the Spirit of Christ*" is the same as "*the Spirit of God,*" i.e., the Holy Ghost, who is not only sent by Christ, but is so essentially one with Christ, that His indwelling is in the next clause described as "*Christ in you;*" see Gal. iv. 6; Phil. i. 19. The theological import of the passage is well explained by Philippi, who shows that, when compared with Gal. iv. 6, it is a clear proof of the procession of the Holy Ghost "from the Father and the Son," as well as "an illustrious testimony concerning the Holy Trinity" (Bengel).

*be is none of his.]* The reason for changing the title "*Spirit of God*" into "*Spirit of Christ*" was to bring out clearly and emphatically this truth that "he that hath not Christ's Spirit, is not Christ's: because Christ gives His Spirit to all that are His" (1 John iv. 13). "To be Christ's" is the same as "to be in Christ" (Gal. iii. 28, 29).

10. *And if Christ be in you.]* "But if Christ is in you:" this is a direct contrast to the latter part of v. 9, and a renewal of the favourable supposition in the former part, "*if the Spirit of God dwelleth in you.*" It now further appears that "to have the Spirit of Christ" (v. 9) is to have Christ Himself dwelling within the heart: compare Eph. iii. 16, 17: "*to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man, that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith.*"

*the body is dead because of sin, but the Spirit is life.]* Rather, "*though the body is dead because of sin, yet the Spirit is life.*"

"*If Christ is in you,*" it follows that "*the Spirit is life;*" yet in contrast to that effect it is admitted (*μέν*) that for the present "*the body is dead;*" but even this contrast and limitation to the Spirit's operation shall be done away hereafter (v. 11).

The reference in v. 11 to the resurrection of the mortal body makes it certain that in saying "*the body is dead*" St. Paul is think-

ing of physical death on account of sin: compare v. 12.

"Methinks" (says Augustine, who dwells much upon this passage), "that thought so clear and plain needs not to be expounded, but only to be read." ('De Peccatorum Meritis,' i. 7).

"The Apostle does not say, 'The body is mortal because of sin,' but '*the body is dead because of sin.*' For prior to Adam's sin it might be called both mortal for one reason and immortal for another reason: that is, mortal, because it was capable of dying; immortal, because it was capable of not dying. . . . And so that animal and therefore mortal body, which on account of righteousness should have become spiritual and therefore altogether immortal, was made on account of sin not 'mortal,' which it was before, but '*dead,*' which it might never have become if man had not sinned."

"How therefore does the Apostle, when speaking about persons still living, call our body '*dead,*' except because the necessity of dying clung to the children from the sin of their parents?" ('De Genesi ad litteram,' vi. 36).

The body thus doomed to certain death, and bearing in itself the germs of corruption, is in St. Paul's vivid conception already "*dead," "a living corpse*" (Soph. 'Antigone,' 1167).

*but the Spirit is life.]* "*the spirit,*" i.e. the human spirit; it is implied not in the word itself, but in the condition "*if Christ is in you,*" that the human spirit is quickened by the indwelling Spirit of God. This reference to the human spirit is proved by the direct contrast of "*the body*" and "*the spirit*" (1 Cor. vii. 34; 2 Cor. vii. 1; Ja. ii. 26), and by the careful distinction of the Divine Spirit in v. 11, as "*the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead.*"

The spirit of man, when renewed and pervaded by the Spirit of Christ, not only lives, but is all "*life,*" essentially and eternally. The inferior reading (ξῆν, "liveth") falls far short of St. Paul's thought: "the Divine life becomes through the Holy Spirit not only a *quality* of the human spirit, it becomes its *nature*, in such wise, that it can diffuse itself through the whole person from the spirit to the soul and body" (Godet).

*because of righteousness.]* Since cause goes before effect, the righteousness which is the conditional *cause* of life in the believer (as sin is the cause of death), is that "*righteousness of God*" which is freely given for Christ's

11 But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.

<sup>1 Or, be-</sup>  
<sup>cause of</sup>  
his Spirit.

sake, which is accompanied by the gift of eternal life (v. 17, 18, 21), and which brings forth as its fruit the works of righteousness.

The same conclusion follows from the antithesis of the two clauses; “*the body is dead because of (Adam’s) sin, but the spirit is life because of (Christ’s) righteousness:*” compare, ch. v. 12, 15, 17.

“Propter justificationem” (Vulg.) is therefore right as a paraphrase, though not as a translation of διὰ δικαιοσύνης. On the other hand Cyril’s interpretation is wholly inadmissible: “Being quickened by the grace of the Holy Spirit and rich in righteousness through communion with Him: for thus are we partakers of the divine nature.”

11. The present possession of the Spirit of God is an assurance that even in the body life shall at last triumph over death. The condition, “*if Christ is in you,*” is now repeated in substance, but changed in form to suit the new statement concerning God’s raising up Jesus from the dead.

*Bu if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you.]* Rather “*dwell-*  
*eth in you:*” see on v. 9.

“The Spirit of God,” called also “*the Spirit of Christ*,” in v. 9, is now introduced under a new title, which in fact forms part of the argument; because it is assumed that He who raised Jesus from the dead can also raise us. Though the Son as God had power to lay down His life and to take it again (John ii. 19, x. 18), yet Jesus as Man is raised by the power of God the Father (Acts ii. 32; Gal. i. 1; Eph. i. 20: compare Pearson, ‘*Creed*,’ Art. v. p. 301).

*be that raised up Christ from the dead.]* The mediatorial title “*Christ*” (“*Christ Jesus*,” Tisch. 8) corresponds to the assumed connection between His resurrection and ours. Compare 1 Cor. vi. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 14.

*shall also quicken your mortal bodies.]* Instead of “raise,” St. Paul now says “quicken,” or “make alive” (*ζωοποιέω*), in correspondence with v. 10: “*the spirit is life*” already, the body also shall be made alive hereafter. In v. 10 the body is called “dead,” a hyperbolic expression, which would be weakened by repeating the same word in the same

12 Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh.

13 For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live.

sense, and obscured by applying it in a different sense to bodies actually dead. St. Paul therefore now applies the proper word “*mortal*” to the present state of the body, which shall hereafter be quickened into immortality.

“He does not say ‘dead bodies,’ but ‘mortal bodies,’ because in the resurrection our bodies shall not only cease to be ‘dead’ (v. 10), i.e. subject to a necessity of death, but also shall cease to be ‘mortal,’ i.e. capable of dying, such as was Adam’s body before his sin. For after the resurrection our bodies shall be altogether immortal.” (Aquinas.)

*by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.]* See note at end of chapter.

The marginal reading “*because of his Spirit that dwelleth in you*” is most in accordance with the language of the N. T., which nowhere represents the Holy Ghost as the special agent or instrument by whom the dead are raised. “The bodies of the saints are the *members of Christ*, and no members of His shall remain in death: they are the *temples of the Holy Ghost*, and therefore if they be destroyed, they shall be raised again.” For “*if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us,*” as He doth, and by so dwelling maketh our bodies temples, “*be which raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies by (because of) His Spirit that dwelleth in us*” (Pearson, ‘*Creed*,’ Art. v.). Compare 2 Cor. v. 5, where St. Paul speaks of the gift of the Spirit as an earnest of the resurrection.

12, 13. Practical exhortation founded upon the consequences which have been shown (vv. 1–11) to follow from living after the flesh or after the Spirit.

*Therefore.]* “*So then:*” as in vii. 3. You have seen (vv. 6–8) that if “flesh” be the ruling principle of your life “*ye must die*” (Tyndale: μάλλον ἀνθίσετε), and this sure and known result is not such as to lay you under any obligation to the flesh: you owe it nothing by anticipation, that you should live according to its rule.

*but if ye through the Spirit do mortify.]*  
*but if by the Spirit ye mortify.]*

In v. 12 the order of the words “*we are*

14 For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.

*debtors—not to the flesh,* leads our thoughts on at once to the well-known and necessary alternative (v. 4), “but to the Spirit that we should live after the Spirit:” the reason therefore of that suppressed alternative is now added.

“*The deeds of the body*” are not bodily acts as such, but its actions or practices (*πράξεις*) considered in their moral tendency, which in this case is towards evil: compare Col. iii. 9.

For “*the body*” is here regarded as “*the body of sin*” (vi. 6), i.e. as ruled by sin dwelling in its flesh. The various reading “*the flesh*” is of less authority.

The way to “*mortify*,” or “*put to death*” (*θαυματύετε*) these “*deeds of the body*,” is to subdue by help of God’s Spirit the sinful desires which are their motive power. In the clauses “*ye shall die*,” “*ye shall live*,” the death and life are both eternal.

14-17. Proof of the promise “*ye shall live*,” from the nature of the indwelling Spirit as a Spirit of adoption.

14. All who are moved and guided by the Spirit and follow His guidance, these, emphatically (*οἵτοι*, vii. 10; Gal. iii. 7) and none but these, are the sons of God, and as sons derive life from the Father, Who is the fount of life. On the difference between receiving the Spirit and being “*led by the Spirit*,” Chrysostom remarks: “Lest in reliance upon the baptismal gift they should be careless of their after life, he says that even if you receive Baptism but intend not to be led by the Spirit afterwards, you have lost the dignity conferred and the pre-eminence of sonship.”

15. In proof of the assertion that “they who are led by the Spirit of God, are the sons of God,” St. Paul appeals to his readers’ experience of the character and effect of the Spirit which they had received.

*For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear.*] “*For ye received not a spirit of bondage again unto fear.*”

The aorist points to the time when believing and being baptized they received the Holy Ghost: that what they then received was “*the Spirit of God*,” by Whom they are still led (v. 14), is clearly stated in Gal. iv. 5, 6, and is here assumed in the appeal to their experience. The question to be decided by that experience is, What kind of spirit that was; and the answer is twofold, the verb being emphatically repeated, “*Ye received not a spirit of bondage, but*

15 For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of

*ye received a spirit of adoption.*” The word “*spirit*” is in both clauses a Common Noun, not a Proper Name, and therefore should not be written with a capital letter. Compare 2 Tim. i. 7.

The “*bondage*” or “*slavery*,” which throughout this Epistle is contrasted with the liberty of the sons of God, is the bondage of sin (vi. 6, 16, 17, 20; vii. 25), and of corruption or death as the consequence of sin (v. 21). The Apostle’s readers, both Jews and Gentiles, had all been *once* under this bondage (vi. 17) which tends “*unto fear*,” even the fear of death (Heb. ii. 14, 15). But the Spirit which they received on becoming Christians was not found to be “*a spirit of bondage tending again unto fear*,” but “*a spirit of adoption*” or “*affiliation*”—a spirit which properly belongs to and is characteristic of adopted children.

*Adoption* was a process unknown to the Jewish law, and the word *víaθεσία*, first found in Gal. iv. 5, was probably formed by St. Paul himself. From this circumstance and from the fact that St. Paul, a Roman citizen, is here writing to Romans, it is almost certain that the allusion is to the Roman law. St. Paul’s word was in later times applied to Baptism (Suicer): he applies it himself to God’s typical adoption of the Jewish nation (ix. 4), to the actual adoption of believers both Jews and Gentiles to be the children of God (Gal. iv. 5; Eph. i. 5), and to their perfected adoption in the future state of glory (viii. 23). Comp. Neander, ‘Planting of Christianity,’ i. 477, and Ellicott, ‘Gal. iv. 5.

In the phrase “*spirit of adoption*” the genitive does not mean that adoption is the effect of having received the Spirit (Athanasius ad Serap. Ep. i. c. 19 *νίσπονόμενοι τῷ πνεύματι*): for in the parallel passage Gal. iv. 6, we see that the adoption goes before the testimony of the Spirit, “*having taken place through faith and justification*” (Meyer). Yet this Pauline doctrine is perfectly consistent with the Spirit’s previous work of regeneration (John iii. 5), for “*Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God*” (1 John v. 1). St. Paul, in fact, is here speaking not of the first secret work of the Spirit in regenerating the soul by faith, but of the subsequent testimony of the Spirit, which, whether accompanied or not by outward signs, bore witness in the hearts of believers that they had become sons of God.

A “*spirit of adoption*” is thus a spirit belonging to adoption as its proper character,

adoption, whereby we cry, *Abba, Father.*

**16** The Spirit itself beareth wit-

and “*a spirit of bondage*” would in like manner be “*a spirit characteristic of bondage*” and so tending “*unto fear*.”

Commentators ancient and modern have here run wild in their attempts to give a positive and personal existence to that of which St. Paul speaks only negatively. “Some say it is the spirit of the Evil One, but it is not so; for it is the Law that he here calls a spirit of bondage” (Severianus in Cramer: so Diidorus, Theodorus). “The law as given by the Holy Spirit” (Theodore). “The Scriptures, as being spiritual and supernatural, but establishing a dispensation in which punishments and rewards were meted out like the daily portion of a slave” (Chrysostom; Theophyl. Ecumen.). Augustine applies it to the Holy Ghost, “because the same Spirit of God, that is, finger of God, whereby the Law was written on tables of stone, struck terror into those who knew not yet God’s grace, that by the Law they might be convinced of their infirmity and sin” (‘Quæst. in Exod.’ iv.; comp. Serm. 156). But in another passage (‘Propositiones ex Ep. ad Rom. expos.’) he explains it as “the spirit of him to whom sinners are in bondage: so that, as the Holy Spirit delivers from the fear of death, the spirit of bondage who hath the power of death holds the guilty in fear of that same death; in order that each may turn to the Deliverer’s help, even in spite of the Devil, who desires to have him in his power always.”

Philippi and others understand the expressions subjectively of the servile and filial spirit or disposition engendered by the Law and the Gospel respectively; but this is opposed to the meaning of *πνεῦμα* required by the context in vv. 14, 16. These difficulties all arise from neglecting the order of the words: St. Paul did not write “Ye have not received again a spirit of bondage,” but “a spirit of bondage bringing you again into a state of fear.” Compare 2 Tim. i. 7.

*whereby we cry.]* Literally “*in which (spirit) we cry*”: compare 1 Cor. xii. 3. In the sudden change from the 2nd to the 1st person we see St. Paul himself in the same filial spirit joining in his brethren’s cry.

*Abba, Father.]* See note on Mark xiv. 36.

**16.** Analysis of what takes place when we in the Spirit cry “*Abba, Father*.” There is then a twofold but united testimony, we cry and the Spirit cries in us (Gal. iv. 6). “*The Spirit itself*,” i.e. the Spirit of God, which has just been described as a spirit of adoption, “*beareth*

ness with our spirit, that we are the children of God:

**17** And if children, then heirs;

*witness with our spirit.*” This rendering is more correct than that of the Vulgate “to our spirit”: it implies that our spirit also bears witness to us, an idea to which Lange strangely objects, forgetting that it is what occurs in every act of consciousness.

St. Paul is conscious that the impulse to cry “*Abba, Father*” proceeds from his own spirit acting under the influence of the Holy Spirit and in concert with Him: compare ii. 15, and ix. 1: “*my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost.*” “This witness of the Spirit is not to be placed merely in the feeling (1 John iii. 19), but His whole inward and outward efficacy must be taken together; for instance. His comfort, His incitement to prayer, His censure of sin, His impulse to works of love, to witness before the world, and so forth. Upon the foundation of this immediate testimony of the Holy Spirit, *all the regenerate man’s conviction of Christ and His work* finally rests. For faith in the Scripture itself has its basis upon this experience of the divinity of the principle which it promises, and which flows into the believer while he is occupied with it.” (Olshausen.)

The passage testifies strongly against the Pantheistic confusion of the human spirit and the Divine.

“The witness of the Spirit is a consciousness of our having received in and by the Spirit of adoption the tempers mentioned in the word of God as belonging to his adopted children,—a loving heart towards God and toward all mankind; hanging with childlike confidence on God our Father; desiring nothing but Him, casting all our care on Him. . . . It is a consciousness that we are inwardly conformed by the Spirit of God to the image of His Son, and that we walk before Him in justice, mercy, and truth, doing the things which are pleasing in His sight.” (Wesley, in Lange’s ‘Commentary.’)

*17. And if children, then heirs.]* The Apostle follows out his proof of the promise in v. 13: “*ye shall live*,” for ye are God’s children (vv. 14–16), and therefore heirs of His inheritance, “*the glory which shall be revealed in us*” (v. 18), which is, in other words, eternal life: compare ii. 7.

For “*sons*” St. Paul now says “*children*,” which is both more tender (Meyer), and more comprehensive. (Gal. iii. 26–28.)

*heirs of God.]* Two thoughts enhance the greatness of the inheritance, that it comes from God, and is shared with Christ. The

heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together.

18 For I reckon that the suffer-

Divine inheritance, unlike the human, is bestowed by the living Father upon His children. (Luke xv. 12.)

*and joint-heirs with Christ.]* By Jewish law the eldest son had the largest share, and daughters were excluded, unless there were no sons. ('Dict. of the Bible,' p. 779, b, 'Heir.') By the Roman law sons and daughters shared equally in the inheritance, and adopted children were treated like others. (Smith's 'Dict. of Gk. and Rom. Antt.', p. 600, a.) Christ admits all His brethren to share alike in that inheritance which He has won, not for Himself but for them.

*if so be that we suffer with him.]* It was part of the Divine order of salvation "that Christ must suffer," and through suffering pass to glory (Luke xxiv. 26, 46; Acts xvii. 3; xxvi. 23; Hebrews ii. 9, 10), and also that His followers must suffer with Him, in order to be glorified together. (Matt. x. 38; xvi. 24; xx. 22; 1 Thess. iii. 3; 2 Cor. i. 5; Col. i. 24; 2 Tim. ii. 12; &c.). To "suffer with him" is to suffer "for His sake, and the Gospel's" (Mark viii. 35): compare 1 Peter iv. 13, "Rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy."

On εἰπεπ̄ see note on v. 9: it represents "the fellowship of his sufferings" (Phil. iii. 10) as an indispensable condition of sharing His glory, a necessary discipline to fit us for that blissful reward which is purchased for us by the sole merit of our Saviour's own sufferings. "In all nations, indeed, and at all times, the way in which men have met death, and women have met suffering, has been a testimony to the conviction that pain, when endured for a moral purpose, may be transformed from a curse into a blessing, and may elevate the nature on which it seems to inflict a wound. But this conviction has been established as one of the supreme laws of human nature by the cross of Christ" (Wace, 'Christianity and Morality,' p. 316).

#### 18-30. THE SOURCES OF COMFORT UNDER THE NECESSITY OF SUFFERING.

These are threefold:

- (1.) The hope of glory to which all creation looks forward (18-25):
- (2.) The present help of the Spirit (26, 27):
- (3.) The all-embracing purpose of God's sure love (28-30).

ings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us.

19 For the earnest expectation of

18. *For I reckon.]* A reason for suffering with Christ in order to be glorified with Him. The connexion with the last words of v. 17 is direct and obvious. The same word (*λογίζομαι*) is rendered in A. V., "think" (ii. 3), "conclude" (iii. 28), "suppose" (2 Cor. xi. 5), "count" (Phil. iii. 13). It does not imply mere supposition or opinion, but the judgment or inference which the Apostle draws from comparing things present and things to come, that the former are of no weight or worth in the comparison. "*This present time*" (*καρπός*) indicates the critical and final season of the dispensation of "this world" (*αἰών*), a season of distress which is to end at Christ's coming: compare iii. 26 and xi. 5 with xiii. 11 and 1 Cor. vii. 29.

*shall be revealed.]* The glory already exists in Christ, it only remains to be revealed in us. St. Paul does not use the simple Future Tense, but (as in v. 13 and iv. 24) an expression (*μελλονταν*) which represents the future revelation of glory as something that is destined to be and will be. Compare Gal. iii. 23, where the same words are used in the same emphatic order. See also Col. iii. 4; Tit. ii. 13; 1 Pet. i. 4.

*in us.]* The Greek preposition (*εἰς*) expresses the thought that the revelation of glory will reach to and take place in us.

19. The certainty of the future revelation of glory in us is confirmed by the sympathetic longings of all around us. Keble, in the 'Christian Year' (4th S. after Trin.), has found a theme for one of his finest poems in these 'Groans of Nature,'—

"Strong yearnings for a blest new birth,  
With sinless glories crown'd."

*the earnest expectation* (compare Phil. i. 20) is described by expressive compounds, such as St. Paul loves, in which hope is depicted both in its eagerness "with head uplift," (*ἀνοκαραδοκία*) and in its perseverance waiting out the end (*ἀπεκδέχεται*: compare 1 Pet. iii. 20).

*the creature.]* Rather "*the creation*," i.e. the things created (Vulg. "creatura"). The word itself is of unlimited application (Mark xiii. 19), and the context only can determine the extent of its meaning.

Of things created, to begin with the highest, good Angels are excluded, for they were not "*made subject to vanity*" (v. 20); and evil

the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God.

20 For the creature was made

subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope,

Angels, for they have no share in the hope of glory: of Mankind it is clear that believers are not here included under "the creation," but mentioned separately and distinctly as sharing the same longing, for "not only they (the creation) but ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we (v. 23) ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption." So far there is a very general consent among interpreters, though some (in defiance of the clear distinction made in vv. 19, 21, 23) maintain that even believers are included under "the creation" as a part under the whole.

The chief point, however, in dispute is the inclusion of the non-Christian portion of mankind.

Now, first the term "creation" (*κτίσις*) when applied to mankind always denotes mankind as a whole, the human creation. But in v. 21 a portion of mankind, "the children of God," are contrasted with, and so excluded from "the creation itself," which term therefore can only mean, "the creation as distinct from mankind," the irrational creation, animate and inanimate. The Apostle "personifies the world, just as the Prophets do when they make the floods clap their hands." (Chrysost.)

It is one of the finest and most frequent figures of speech thus to make Nature sympathise with man: when the Assyrian is overthrown, God says, "I caused Lebanon to mourn for him, and all the trees of the field fainted for him." (Ezek. xxxi. 15.) Here in like manner St. Paul undoubtedly ascribes human feelings to things without reason and without life; but he does much more. Under this beautiful figure, as its most appropriate dress, he presents the grand truth revealed in the Old Testament that the whole world of nature, so much of it at least as was placed under man's dominion, has a real concern in the past history and future destiny of Man. When God says to Adam, "cursed is the ground for thy sake" (Gen. iii. 17); when the Flood, by which Man's wickedness is punished destroys "every living substance which was upon the face of the ground" (Gen. vii. 23): when "the earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant," and "therefore bath the curse devoured the earth," and when not only "they that dwell therein are desolate," but also "the new wine mourneth, the vine languisheth," "the windows from on high are open, and the foundations of the earth do shake" (Is. xxiv. 5 ff.);

in all such passages, whether historical, poetical, or prophetic, the same truth, or at all events the same doctrine, is expressed which St. Paul states in v. 20, that "the creation was subjected to vanity."

When once this is admitted, there is no room left for the argument that Man must be included by St. Paul in "the creation" as "that which gives propriety, consistency, and beauty to the whole representation." (Forbes.)

If "in speaking of that glorious restitution of all things, which has been the theme of all the Prophets, and the great hope of the Church since the world began, St. Paul mentions on the one hand the little flock that had then received the first-fruits of the Spirit, and on the other hand, the material and irrational creation;" it does not follow that "the innumerable multitudes of 'all the families of the earth,' not yet converted to Christ, are by him who was specially called to be the Apostle of the Gentiles passed by, without a thought on their condition or destiny!"

The truth is that like Isaiah (lxv. 17), like St. Peter (2nd Ep. iii. 13), and like St. John (Rev. xxi. 1), St. Paul looked for "a new heaven and a new earth;" but before that "restitution of all things," he expected that "the fulness of the Gentiles" should come in, and "all Israel be saved." Mankind therefore, so far as they fulfil their proper destiny, in accordance with the great promise, "in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," are all included among "the sons of God," while "the whole creation" includes all the irrational creatures, animate or inanimate, as in Wisdom xvi. 24; xix. 6.

*[the manifestation of the sons of God.]* That is "the revelation of the sons of God" themselves, not merely of their glory: they will become known as "the sons of God" through the glory which shall then be imparted to them. At present, though known of God and knowing Him as their Father (vv. 14-17), "the world knoweth them not, because it knew him not." (1 John iii. 1.)

## 20, 21. THE CAUSE OF THE LONGING AND THE GROUND OF THE EXPECTATION.

*[20. the creature was made subject to vanity.]* The creation was subjected to vanity. The emphasis is on the "vanity," that well-known vanity of things created (*τὴν παραίτητην*). "Though all things were made very good, yet when the first man sinned they were corrupted, and shall return no more to their

**21** Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

<sup>Or, every creature.</sup> **22** For we know that <sup>the</sup> whole

proper state, until Pherez, i. e. Messias, shall come." (Beresh. Rabb. f. 2, 3. Reiche.)

The Greek word rendered "*vanity*" is from a root which means "to seek without finding," and so implies "frustration": but this etymological sense must not be pressed, it is the word commonly used in the Septuagint, *e. g.* in Ecclesiastes i. 2, ii. 1, for the Hebrew חֶבֶל (Hebel, Abel), "breath," "vapour," applied to all that is frail and fleeting. Compare note on **i. 21.**

*not willingly.*] Subjection to vanity is contrary to that tendency of nature, which leads each creature to seek its own preservation and perfection. This tendency is compared to the human Will, because creation is personified.

*but by reason of him who hath subjected the same.*] Rather, "but on account of him who subjected it." (See note on John vi. 57.) The Apostle mentions no other cause of the subjection of the creation to vanity than the agency and will of "*him who subjected it.*" This, in accordance with the history, can be no other than God. He who first placed the creature under man's dominion also "*subjected it*" to the effects of man's sin (Gen. iii. 17, v. 29), and will make it partaker of the blessing of his restoration. Compare Is. lxv. 17 ff.; lxvi. 22; Ps. cii. 26, 27; 2 Pet. iii. 13; Rev. xxi. 1; and see note on Is. xi. 6 as to the reasonableness of this Scriptural doctrine of the new creation.

*in hope, because the creature itself also.*] Rather, "*in hope that the creation itself also.*" These words are best connected with the former part of **v. 20**: the subjection was not absolute and unconditional, but the condition upon which "*the creation was subjected to vanity*" was a *hope* granted to it, that it also shall share in man's deliverance. This purport of the hope must be expressly stated, in order to show the ground of the expectation in **v. 19**, as directed precisely to the manifestation of the sons of God. An undefined hope might supply a motive for expectation of deliverance in general, but not for expectation of sharing in the glory of the children of God. (Meyer.)

*the bondage of corruption.*] "*Corruption*" includes the daily perishing as well as the final dissolution of things created. This subjection to decay and death is what St. Paul

creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now.

**23** And not only *they*, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan

calls "*the bondage of corruption.*" Compare Heb. ii. 15; 2 Cor. iv. 16.

*the glorious liberty, &c.*] Rather, "*the liberty of the glory of the children of God.*" This glory, being a full and perfect development of all the faculties and powers of our nature, is rightly called "*liberty*" in opposition to "*the bondage of corruption.*" The whole creation is to undergo a corresponding change, and become the fit scene of the glory of God's children. "In those days shall the whole creation be changed for the better, and return to its pristine perfection and purity, such as it was in the time of the first man before his sin" (R. Bechah Schulchan Orba, f. 9, col. 4, quoted by Reiche).

**22.** Proof of the reality of this hope of deliverance (**v. 21**), from the present signs of pain and travail.

*For we know.*] St. Paul appeals to his own and his readers' knowledge of a condition of all nature, analogous to that of a woman in travail. The knowledge of *the fact*, which alone is meant here, is derived from observation and experience: the knowledge of its dependence on man's Fall (**v. 20**) is derived from revelation. This groaning of creation is universal, consistent (*συμφώνως*, Theophil.), and unceasing. The *whole* creation groaneth *together* from the day of its subjection *until now*. These pangs of a world in travail cannot be unmeaning: they point to a coming time of delivery, when "there shall be new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness."

**23.** Beyond this fact of common experience lies another, peculiar to the *Christian* consciousness, and of yet deeper significance for the reality of the hope of deliverance described in **v. 21.**

*And not only they.*] Rather, *And not only the creation.* The word to be supplied, for there is none in the Greek, is clearly indicated by the antithesis which follows—"but we ourselves also."

*which have the firstfruits of the Spirit.*] Rather, "*though we have*," &c. This clause completes the climax of proof by the thought that even Christians, though so highly favoured as recipients of the first outpouring of the Spirit, were not exempt from an eager and painful longing for the full liberty and glory which were yet to be bestowed on them. Not only the Apostles on the day of

within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, *to wit*, the "redemption of our body."

<sup>\* Luke 21. 28.</sup> 24 For we are saved by hope: but hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?

Pentecost, but all who in that first age had been added to the Church through their teaching, are regarded by St. Paul as sharing in the first gift of that Spirit, which is in due time to be poured out on all flesh: they have the first-fruits which are to be followed by the great harvest. That harvest must be fully gathered, before the final revelation of glory can take place, or the longing and sighing cease.

*even we ourselves.*] We ourselves also: this rendering preserves the emphatic repetition of the original, according to the reading preferred by recent critics. The various readings do not materially affect the general sense.

*groan within ourselves.*] The longing of creation is expressed in outward signs and in a sort of universal sympathy (*συντεράγει*): the longing of the believer is inward, known only to his own heart.

*waiting for the adoption.*] Rather, *waiting for adoption*. Believers have already received adoption in part, namely in God's purpose and in the gift of a Spirit which belongs only to God's children (*vv. 14–16*); but are still waiting for that final, complete, and public adoption which will take place in "*the revelation of the sons of God*" (*v. 19*).

*to wit, the redemption of our body.*] By this apposition the Apostle explains how those who are already the sons of God can still be waiting for adoption. The adoption, "viewed specifically as complete" (Lange), is identified with that part which completes it, namely "*the redemption of our body*" from its present condition of weakness, sinfulness, decay, and death: "*For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven*" (*2 Cor. v. 2*).

24. *For we are saved by hope.*] For in hope we were saved. St. Paul says sometimes "ye" (or we) were saved (*Rom. viii. 24*), or "Ye have been saved" (*Ephes. ii. 5, 8*), sometimes "Ye are being saved" (*1 Cor. xv. 2*), and sometimes "Ye shall be saved" (*Rom. x. 9, 13*). It is important to observe this, because we are thus taught that "salvation" involves a moral condition which must have begun already, though it will receive its final accomplishment hereafter" (Bp. Light-

25 But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it.

26 Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh

foot, 'Revision,' p. 94). The reason why we are still waiting for the redemption of our body is that the salvation of which we were made partakers (by faith not "*by hope*") is still an object of hope, not of complete realisation and present possession. The A. V. "*by hope*" disregards St. Paul's distinction between faith and hope: "faith accepts the present remission of sins; hope is the expectation of future deliverance" (Melanchthon). On the "modal" dative see Winer, § xxxi. 7, d.

*but hope that is seen.*] "A hope" means in this clause a thing hoped for (*Col. i. 5; 1 Tim. i. 1; Acts xxviii. 20*). When already present before the eyes it ceases to be an object of hope: for it is of the essence of hope that it looks not at the things that are seen, but at the things that are not seen (*Heb. xi. 1*).

*for what a man seeth, why doth he also hope for?*] The actual sight and possession of the object leaves no room for hope properly so called. But if the object of our hope is unseen, then we naturally fall into the proper attitude of hope, and wait "in patience." On this sense of *διά* with the genitive, see notes on *ii. 27, iv. 11, xiv. 20*, and Winer, p. iii. § 47.

## 26, 27. THE PRESENT HELP OF THE SPIRIT.

This is the second ground of encouragement to wait patiently amid present suffering for the glory which shall be revealed: see on *v. 18*.

26. *Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities.*] "And in like manner the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity." The passage refers not to "*infirmities*" in general, but particularly to "*infirmity*" under present suffering and waiting: this connexion with the preceding context is clearly shown by the word "*likewise*" (*ὡμοίως*). As we on our part wait in patience, so on God's part there is the Holy Spirit joining His help with our weakness. The patient expectation, which follows from the nature of hope, would fail through our infirmity, if the latter were not sustained by the help of God's Spirit.

Van Hengel's interpretation of "*the Spirit*" as meaning the spirit of God's children, the trust and confidence with which the Holy Spirit inspires them, is excluded by such ex-

intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.

27 And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of

the Spirit, "because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God." Or, that

28 And we know that all

pressions as "*the mind of the Spirit*," "*the Spirit maketh intercession for us*," which imply a person, and a person distinct from the believer himself.

Before proceeding to describe *how* the Spirit helpeth our infirmity the Apostle shows more fully the nature of that infirmity in reference to prayer. We know not what our prayer should be, for two reasons, because the future is still hidden, and even in the present life we know not what is best for us (Augustine).

*for we know not what we should pray for as we ought.] "for what to pray according to our need, we know not."* The use of the Greek Article is noticeable: it turns the question "What should we pray?" into an Objective Sentence dependent on *οὐκ οἴδαμεν*. We know not the—what to pray, &c. The construction is characteristic of St. Paul and St. Luke: see Luke i. 62; ix. 46; xix. 48; xxii. 2, 4, 23, 24, 37; Acts iv. 24; xxii. 30; Rom. xiii. 9; Gal. v. 14; Eph. iv. 9; 1 Thess. iv. 1. "*What we should pray for*" is less correct than "*What we should pray*," i.e. what our prayer should be: compare Luke xviii. 11; Phil. i. 9; 1 Kings viii. 30, 48; 2 Kings xix. 20. "*According to our need*": the Greek adverb does not refer to the *manner* of praying, but to the correspondence between the prayer and that which is really needed.

Pythagoras forbade his disciples to pray for themselves, because they knew not what was expedient. Socrates more wisely taught his disciples to pray simply for good things, the Gods knowing best what sort of things are good (Xen. 'Mem. Socratis,' I. ii. 20). But better illustrations of St. Paul's meaning are found in his own experience, recorded in Philipp. i. 22, 23. "*What I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ*," and in the experience of Our Lord Himself, "*Now is my soul troubled: and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify thy name*" (John xii. 27, 28).

*but the Spirit itself.] Observe the climax: the whole creation groans together: we ourselves, though we have the first-fruits of the Spirit, groan within ourselves: nay more, the Holy Spirit Himself intercedes for us with groanings.*

Thus the ascending order of thought, the

emphatic form "*the Spirit himself*," and the phrase "*maketh intercession for us*," show that neither the sanctified human spirit, nor any spiritual gift, such as the gift of prayer and intercession, can satisfy the Apostle's meaning. It is the Holy Ghost himself that intercedes, and that with groanings which are His, inasmuch as they are prompted by Him and express "*the mind of the Spirit*." Yet St. Paul does not represent the Holy Spirit, as Jesus is represented by St. John, "*groaning within himself*." "It is not in Himself, not in the substance of the Eternal and Blessed Trinity, but it is in us that He groans, because He makes us groan" (August. Tract. in Joh. vi. 2).

*with groanings which cannot be uttered.] Or—"with speechless groanings."* "Not in words but in groans doth the Spirit make intercession for the Saints, and in such groans as cannot be uttered in words. For how can language express what God's Spirit speaks to God, when sometimes even our own spirit cannot explain in words what it feels and thinks?" (Origen).

St. Paul means certainly more than any merely human emotion, however deep and holy; the groanings of the Holy Spirit cannot be uttered in the language of earth, nor His meaning fully known to man. The believer himself is conscious that he cannot express in words the infinite hopes and longings that he feels. But God is "He that searcheth the hearts" of men and knows all that is done there: and the heart, regarded as the seat of spiritual as well as natural life is the sphere of the Spirit's working: there He intercedes for us, using the heart as the instrument of His appeal to God; and so God "*knoweth what is the mind* (or "*meaning, φρόνμα*) *of the Spirit*": compare v. 6.

27. *because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God.] "because according to God's will he maketh intercession for saints."* Literally, "according to God," as in 2 Cor. viii. 9, 10, "*sorrow according to God.*" These words (*κατὰ Θεόν*) are placed first because they are emphatic.

*for saints:*" the absence of the Article brings out the essential quality.

Thus the clause combines two reasons in one, why God must know what the meaning of the Spirit is: for (1) His intercession is in accordance with God's own will and purpose, "*for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, even the deep things of God*" (1 Cor. ii. 10),

things work together for good to them that love God, to them who

are the called according to his purpose.

and (2) His intercession is "for saints," and saints, as such, are the special objects of the Divine purpose, in accordance with which the Spirit intercedes. The two thoughts thus combined, God's purpose on behalf of saints, form the theme of the next paragraph.

### 28-30. THE ALL-EMBRACING PURPOSE OF GOD'S LOVE.

To the inward comfort which the Holy Spirit imparts to God's children, St. Paul now adds a third and last ground of encouragement, our knowledge that in the Divine government of the world all things contribute to the welfare of those who love God: even the troubles therefore of this life, so far from hindering our salvation, help it forward.

**28. all things.]** I.e. all, whether prosperous or adverse, all including "*the sufferings of this present time.*" The context requires this special reference to sufferings.

The reading "God worketh all things," has less authority, and is not so well suited to the context.

**work together.]** Not merely does the joint and combined working of the whole result in a preponderance of good, but adverse circumstances as well as prosperous, each and all, conduce to good. See the Additional Note.

"When he says 'all things,' he means even things that seem to be painful. For even if affliction, poverty, imprisonment, hunger, death, or any other thing should come upon thee, God is able to turn all these the contrary way. Since this also is part of His ineffable power, to make what things seem troublesome light to us, and turn them to our help" (Chrysostom).

**for good.]** Not only their future and eternal happiness, but all that now supports and helps them on the way to attain it is included in the term "good."

**to them that love God.]** The importance of this condition is marked in the Greek by its emphatic position at the beginning of the clause. "Love causes believers to take all things that God sends them favourably and in good part" (Bengel). See Ecclesiasticus xxxix. 27, "*All these things are for good to the godly; so to the sinners they are turned into evil.*" God Himself is man's chief good, and the love of God is thus a necessary condition for the full enjoyment of His gifts, whether temporal or eternal; in other words, they are prepared for those who love Him (see

1 Cor. ii. 9; Eph. vi. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 8; Jaa. i. 12, ii. 5; and Hooker, 'E. P.' I. xi. 2).

**to them who are the called according to his purpose.]** This second description of the same class of persons is not a correction or limitation of the previous definition "*them that love God,*" but a statement of the cause why all things work together for their good, namely, that they "*who love God*" are the very class of persons who are "*called according to his purpose.*" Their love of God is a necessary condition, but God's own purpose, working efficaciously in and for those who are called in accordance with it, is the *cause* that makes all things work together for their good. The *purpose* being that of Him "*who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will*" (Eph. i. 11), it follows that all must work for good to them who are called according to that purpose. It is strange that so enlightened an interpreter as Chrysostom should understand by "*purpose*" nothing more than the will or purpose of man assenting to the outward call. For the true meaning compare ix. 11; Eph. i. 11, iii. 11; 2 Tim. i. 9.

The contrast between the "*many called*" and "*few chosen*" (Matt. xx. 16; xxii. 14), is found only in our Lord's own teaching. The word "*called*" (*κλητός*) is applied by St. Paul only to those who have, as far as man can judge, obeyed the call: its use thus corresponds to that of "*elect*," "*saints*," with which it is sometimes combined. See i. 6, 7; 1 Cor. i. 2, 24; Jude i.; Apoc. xvii. 14. Moreover, those "*who love God*" have in themselves the witness that they are "*called according to His purpose,*" the call has produced its right effect, and the moral condition for further progress is satisfied. The Apostle thus begins with what is known and practical, and his subsequent statements in vv. 29, 30, are distinctly limited to those individuals in whom these practical results are found. These positive results already realised he traces back to their eternal cause, in order to show that the steps still to be accomplished (glorification, &c.) are guaranteed by those already made, all being links in the sure chain of an unfailing and eternal purpose. That purpose, as traced out in the following verses, has its eternal foundation in foreknowledge and predestination, its temporal realisation in the Divine acts of calling and justifying, and its eternal fulfilment in glory. Compare Leighton on 1 Pet. i. 2: "The connexion of these we are now for our profit to take notice of: that *effectual calling* is inseparably tied to this eternal foreknowledge or election on

29 For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate *to be* conformed to

the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren.

the one side, and to *salvation* on the other. These two links of the chain are up in heaven in God's own hand; but this middle one is let down to earth into the hearts of His children, and they laying hold on it, have sure hold on the other two, for no power can sever them."

29-30. At this point St. Paul passes from the province of Christian experience to that of Divine Philosophy. As we follow him, let us bear in mind the wise caution of Hooker (I. ii. 2): "Dangerous it were for the feeble brain of man to wade far into the doings of the Most High: whom although to know be life, and joy to make mention of His name; yet our soundest knowledge is to know that we know Him not as indeed He is, neither can know Him; and our safest eloquence concerning Him is our silence, when we confess without confession that His glory is inexplicable, His greatness above our capacity and reach."

On a path so high and slippery for human reason our safety lies in planting our steps only where the inspired Apostle has already planted his: if we venture, as too many have ventured, beyond the limits of his track, there are precipices and chasms on every side, which the most wary can hardly escape.

It is well therefore to notice in the outset that the Apostle's statements in this passage are limited to the class of persons already doubly defined (1) as those who love God, and (2) as those who are called according to His purpose. His whole subject is their predestination to glory: no opposite view concerning the ungodly, no doctrine of an eternal reprobation, is even suggested.

29. The confidence expressed in v. 28 "that all things work together for good to them that love God" is now justified and confirmed (*γάπ*) by an explanation of the mode in which God's purpose concerning them is developed. For that purpose includes all the stages in the process of salvation, and these are so linked together that where one has taken place the rest must follow, from the unity of the Divine purpose and the continuity of its working.

And since God's love has thus secured the final happiness of "those who are called according to His purpose," nothing really hurtful can happen to them even in this life: afflictions are nothing else but the means by which they are "*to be conformed to the image of his Son*" in sufferings as in glory (v. 17).

*For whom he did foreknow.]* The many various senses here attributed to the Divine

foreknowledge may be classed somewhat as follows:—

(1) "Foreknew"—simply as persons to come into existence hereafter.

This is too general and vague, because *all* are thus foreknown, while the foreknowledge here meant is limited to the particular persons who become predestinated, called, &c.

(2) "Foreknew"—as good and worthy to be known, *i.e.* approved: so Origen.

Or, "foreknew" as those who would believe and obey the call (Augustine's earlier view: 'Propos. ex Ep. ad. Rom. iv.'): "nec praedestinavit aliquem nisi quem praeescivit crediturum et secuturum vocationem suam, quos et electos dicit").

These and other like interpretations, which make faith, obedience, or moral worth the object of the Divine foreknowledge here meant, are rightly rejected as adding an idea which is contained neither in the word *προέγνω* nor in the context.

Meyer's interpretation—"foreknew as those who should one day become conformed to the image of his Son"—is in like manner to be rejected as adding an idea which has not yet been presented in the preceding context, and which cannot be ascribed to *προέγνω* without destroying the distinction between it and *προώρισεν*.

(3) "Foreknew" is taken as equivalent to "fore-ordained," knew and adopted them as His own, of His own free love and absolute decree (Calvin, Leighton, Haldane):

The objections to this third interpretation are:—

(a) That it is not supported by the usage of the word.

(b) That it identifies and confounds two ideas which Scripture keeps distinct, foreknowledge and election, *e.g.* 1 Pet. i. 2, "elect according to the foreknowledge of God."

(4) "Foreknew" as the individual objects of His purpose (*πρόθεσις*), and therefore foreknew as "*them that love God*:" see notes on v. 28.

This interpretation introduces nothing that is not already found in the preceding context, and retains the simple and proper meaning of *προέγνω*. Nor is it open to any charge of making human *merit* the ground of God's election; for the love which He foreknew is but the answer to *His love* poured out in the heart by His Spirit (v. 5).

"Foreknowledge" is the act of conscious perception, without which there can be no volition. Augustine makes a clear distinction: "there can be no predestination without foreknowledge: but there may be fore-

30 Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified.

31 What shall we then say to

these things? If God be for us, who can be against us?

32 He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?

knowledge without predestination: God may foreknow also things which He does not Himself do" ("De Prædest. Sanctorum," x.)

God's eternal purpose embraces all stages in salvation from first to last. His *foreknowledge defines persons* as the objects of that purpose not arbitrarily, but as included in the class of "*them that love God*"; His election, actuated by love, *chooses those persons* [not expressed in this passage]; His *predestination* determines what He will do for them.

*be also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son.*] The Divine predestination is in the New Test. always qualified, as here, by a statement of its end and aim: compare Acts iv. 28; 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. i. 5, 11. See the Additional Note.

By "*the image of his Son*" is not meant the example or pattern of Christ's sufferings (Calvin), or of His holy obedience, but the embodiment of the Divine and human natures in the Incarnate Word. Compare 1 Cor. xv. 49; 2 Cor. iii. 18; Col. i. 15, iii. 10.

Of that Divine Image each glorified saint will be a particular form: and conformity to that Image in body, soul, and spirit is "*the glory which shall be revealed in us*" (v. 18), as the result of God's predestination.

But the full and final aim of that predestination, reaching beyond us to Christ, is "*that He might be the firstborn among many brethren,*" not standing in His "sole glory" as the only begotten Son of God, but making us His brethren by a new creation, and so "*bringing many sons unto glory.*" (Compare Col. i. 15, 18; Heb. i. 6, ii. 10, 11.)

30. *Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called.*] We here pass from the eternal counsel in its ideal process to its realisation in time. Here also three Divine acts are specified,—he "called," "justified," "glorified."

"*Called*," i.e. by the preaching of the Gospel, as in 2 Thess. ii. 14, "*Whereunto be called you by our gospel.*" But the usage of the verb in this sense, like that of *κλητός*, seems to be limited by the context to the cases of effectual calling: here certainly it is so. Compare Reuss, "Théologie chrétienne," ii. 120.

Such a calling is of necessity followed by justification, even as justification by glorification. Otherwise God's foreknowledge and prede-

tination would be falsified. The Aorist "represents the future glorification as so necessary and certain that it appears as if already given and completed with the *εδικαιώσεων*." (Meyer, who refers to Herm. Vig. p. 747.) Rather, the Aorist has the same sense in all the clauses: it represents each act as complete (and therefore certain) *without determining* (*αἴροτος*) its relative time whether Past, Present, or Future. This admirably serves "the triumphant flow of the great chain of thought, and the thoroughly Pauline boldness of expression." (Meyer.)

### 31-39. THE BLESSEDNESS OF THE ELECT.

The doctrine implied in v. 28, and developed in vv. 29, 30, is now applied to the encouragement of the believer.

"The inspired faith of the Apostle, leaving all earthly things far down below his feet, reflects itself in the sublimity of the language." (Philippi.)

31. *What shall we then say to these things?*] Rather, as in vi. 1, vii. 1. "*What shall we say then,*" &c. Looking at these things, the revealed purpose of God and all the sure steps of its fulfilment, what inference shall we draw?

"*If God be* (rather, "*is*") *for us,*" (as these things plainly show) *who can be against us?* This is the first of a stream of rapid and exulting questions, in which the Apostle cannot wait for any formal answer.

32. *He that spared not his own Son.*] This "climax of God's mercies" (Theodoret), the strongest of all proofs that "*God is for us,*" is brought forward with an emphasis (*ός γέ*) that we cannot imitate, as the sure ground of the question that follows. The allusion to Gen. xxiii. 12, 16, is too close to be accidental: St. Paul uses the very word (*έσπειρεν*, "spared") which the LXX. use concerning Abraham. This expression proves incidentally, but most clearly, that St. Paul regarded the Son of God as being of *one nature with the Father*: otherwise where would be the force of the comparison with the human father who withheld not his only son.

"Thus has God Himself fulfilled that which in Abraham's symbolic offering He acknowledged as the highest possible proof of love." (Philippi.)

33 Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? *It is God that justifieth.*

34 Who is he that condemneth? *It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.*

35 Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? *shall tribulation,*

or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?

36 As it is written, <sup>b</sup>*For thy sake* <sup>Ps. 44</sup><sub>22</sub> we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter.

37 Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us.

*delivered him up.] I.e. to death: see iv. 25.*

*how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?] The greatest and most costly gift ensures all the rest that depend on it, all the things (*τὰ πάντα*) that God has promised to us in Christ. To give freely (*χαρίζεσθαι*) is agreeable to God's nature: to deliver up his Son to death, and not to spare Him, was the greatest sacrifice God could make for man. Thus the argument is like that in ch. v. 9, 10, where see notes.*

33—35. The punctuation and division of verses in the A. V. must be slightly corrected, to bring out the rhythmic flow of thought and language in this noble passage. Still full of the thought of God's sure love, the Apostle asks triumphantly, “*Who shall lay any charge against God's elect?*” He makes answer to himself in another question: “*It is God that justifieth: Who is he that condemneth?*” And then, as if bounding on from one rock to another, he passes from the Father's love to that of the Son:

“*It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen, who is also at the right hand of God, Who also maketh intercession for us: Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?*”

This order is adopted by the early Greek commentators: and is confirmed by reference to the source of the Apostle's thoughts in Isaiah l. 8, 9, where we have the same parallelism: “*He is near that justifieth me; who will contend with me?*” . . . “*Bebold, the Lord God will help me; who is he that shall condemn me?*” It is the only order that fully preserves the simplicity, freedom, and vigour of this loftiest flight of Christian eloquence.

“*God's elect,*” as such (observe the absence of the article), need fear no accuser: it is God Himself, the Judge of all, that justifies them (v. 30); who then is there to condemn them?

In Isaiah it is Messiah Himself that thus speaks; a fact which makes St. Paul's rapid transition to the mention of Christ's love more easy and natural.

*It is Christ that died.]* St. Paul accumulates

the proofs of love and power: of love, for “*it is Christ that died*” for our sins; of power, for He not only died, but also *is risen* for our justification; of power again, for it is the same Christ “*who is also at the right hand of God;*” and then, finally, of love still abiding, for it is He “*who also maketh intercession for us.*”

35. The sure inference from such proofs of both the will and power to save, is expressed in the triumphant question: “*Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?*”

By “*the love of Christ*” is meant, not our love to Him, but His love to us, of which the proofs have been given in v. 34. This sense is confirmed by v. 37, “*through him that loved us.*”

*shall tribulation, or distress.] See on ii. 9. These things might cut off man's love from us, but cannot hinder Christ's love from reaching and saving us.*

On the various reading see Additional Note.

36. *as it is written.]* Closely connected with the last word “*sword.*”

In the midst of his enumeration of sufferings and perils, suggested, doubtless by his own experience (2 Cor. vi. 4), St. Paul is reminded by the word “*sword,*” of a passage in Ps. xliv. 22, which describes the like sufferings of God's faithful people in an earlier age, and which the Apostle regards as typical of the persecutions to which the faithful are exposed in his own age. “*But there is this remarkable difference between the tone of the Psalmist and the tone of the Apostle. The former cannot understand the chastening, and complains that God's heavy hand has been laid without cause upon His people: the latter can rejoice, in persecution also, and exclaim, ‘Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors.’*” (Perowne). See notes on the 44th Psalm.

37. *Nay.]* Literally, “*But.*” The negative answer is omitted as self-evident, and the question met at once by a directly contrary affirmation.

*we are more than conquerors.]* An excellent rendering, first introduced in the Geneva Bible, 1557. Compare 2 Cor. iv. 8—11, 17.

38 For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers,

nor things present, nor things to come,

39 Nor height, nor depth, nor

"A holy arrogance of victory, not selfish, but in the consciousness of the might of Christ" (Meyer). "More than conquerors? What is that? Why they (i. e. the adversaries) are not only overcome and disarmed, but they are brought over to our faction; they war on our side." (Chillingworth, Serm. V. § 61.) "This is a new order of victory, to conquer by means of our adversaries" (Chrysostom).

*through him that loved us.]* This must refer to Christ, through whose inseparable love (v. 35) we are made conquerors.

The aorist points to His one greatest act of love, already mentioned in v. 34. Compare v. 6.

38. The answer given in v. 37 is now confirmed by a declaration of the Apostle's own personal conviction, that no power in heaven or earth, in time or in eternity, can separate us from the Divine love.

What St. Paul thus expresses is a moral conviction rather than a logical certainty. It may be asked, Cannot the believer fall away? Is not this implied in such cases as that of Demas, 2 Tim. iv. 10, and in St. Paul's own words, "If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel, which ye have heard" (Col. i. 23)? The answer is well given by Godet: "In the moral life freedom has always its part, as it had from the first moment of believing. What St. Paul means is that nothing shall pluck us out of Christ's arms *against our will*, and as long as we refuse not ourselves to abide there: compare Joh. x. 28–30."

*neither death, nor life.]* The last point mentioned in the question (vv. 35, 36) is taken up first, "death," with its opposite, "life;" compare xiv. 8. The argument requires that the words should have their widest sense, as general states in one or other of which we must be found. Explanations such as "the fear of death, the love of life" (Grotius), or "death with its agonies, life with its distractions and temptations" (Godet), only limit the flight of the Apostle's thoughts just when they would soar above all limitations.

*nor angels, nor principalities,]* The angels mentioned in the N. T. are much more frequently the good than the evil; but the word itself never indicates the specific quality, either good or evil, this being either expressed, or at least implied, in the context. Meyer's assertion that "*angels*" used absolutely signifies

nothing else than simply good angels, is arbitrary in such passages as Acts xxiii. 8, 1 Cor. iv. 9, and quite inadmissible in 1 Cor. vi. 3; Heb. ii. 16.

In our present passage "*angels*" and "*principalities*" must both have the widest possible application: the point in question is not the moral disposition, whether good or evil, but the power of the angelic order of created things.

"*Principalities*" are angels of greater power and might (Eph. vi. 12; 2 Pet. ii. 11).

*nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers.]* This seems the more natural order, "*powers*" being akin to "*principalities*" (1 Cor. xv. 24; Eph. i. 21): but the weight of ancient authority is in favour of a different arrangement:

1	2
Neither death, nor life,	
3	4
Nor angels, nor principalities,	
5	6
Nor things present, nor things to come,	
7	8
Nor powers,	
9	10
Nor height, nor depth,	
Nor any other creature."	

"The principle of arrangement would seem to be, to place alternately inanimate and animate objects, reserving '*creature*,' which sums up the whole, to the last line, in order to denote that 'the dominion over all the works of God's hands,' originally designed for man (Gen. i. 26; Ps. viii. 6), which he had lost by having bowed down to and 'served the creature' (Rom. i. 25), should now, through his union with Christ Jesus, be restored to him, 'all things being put in subjection under his feet,' Heb. ii. 8" (Forbes). If the order has this significance, it may be attributed to St. Paul's familiarity with Hebrew poetry, in which the most perfect parallelism is often found in passages of the most fervid eloquence.

Meyer arranges the *ten* in two *pairs*, followed by two *threes*.

*nor things present, nor things to come.]* No dimensions of time: "*nor height, nor depth;*" no dimensions of space.

These abstractions bring out the idea of universality more emphatically, and suit the rhetorical character of the passage better than any more limited expressions, such as "heaven or earth," "heaven or hell," by which some would interpret them.

any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

*[nor any other creature.]* No state, no being, no power, nor property, such as those already mentioned, “nor any other created thing,” in short, nothing in the created universe, “shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord!” Origen, in Cramer’s ‘Catena,’ p. 156, suggests another interpretation of the words (*κτίσις ἐρέπα*): “But if besides this whole visible creation there is another creation, which though in nature visible is as yet unseen, you will ask whether to that may be referred the saying ‘*nor any other creation shall be able to separate us from the love of God*’.” In support of this view Origen refers to Ephes. i. 21, where Christ is seated “*far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come*.” A very similar interpretation is approved by Chrysostom, as well suited to the sublimity of the passage.

*[the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.]* These last words teach us that “Christ’s love” (v. 35) is no other than “God’s love” manifested to us, and operating on our behalf in the Person of Christ: see Note on v. 8.

This noble hymn of victory (vv. 31–39), while growing naturally out of its immediate context (vv. 28–30), and having a primary reference to the sure triumph of them that love God, forms at the same time a grand conclusion to the whole doctrinal portion of the Epistle. “It is the crown of that edifice of salvation in Christ, of which St. Paul had laid the foundation in his demonstration of the righteousness of faith (i.–v.) and raised the superstructure in his exposition of sanctification (vi.–viii.). After this it will only remain for us to see the salvation, thus studied in its essence, unfold itself upon the stage of history” (Godet).

#### ADDITIONAL NOTES on vv. 2, 3, 9, 11, 28, 29, 35.

2. For ἡλευθέρωσέ με Tischendorf (8) reads ἡλευθέρωσεν σέ, with B & F G. Tertullian’s reading varies: he has “te” in ‘De Pudicitia,’ c. 17, but “me” in ‘De Resurrectione Carnis,’ c. 46. The First Person is much more natural in the connexion with c. VII., and σέ may have come from the last syllable of ἡλευθέρωσεν.

Here then, as below in v. 35, it must be admitted that the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS., notwithstanding their general excellence, give an inferior reading.

3. a. It is generally agreed that τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου is a nominative absolute (cf. Eur. ‘Troad.’ 489) in apposition to the sentence, ὁ Θεὸς κατέκρινεν, κ.τ.λ.

But ἀδύνατος is sometimes active, “unable” (Acts xiv. 8; Rom. xv. 1), and sometimes passive, “impossible” (Matt. xix. 26; Heb. vi. 4, 18; x. 4).

The passive sense, “that which was impossible to the law,” is well paraphrased in the A. V., “*that which the law could not do,*” and is preferred by Meyer and Alford.

The objection to it is that St. Paul would have written τὸ ἀδύνατον τῷ νόμῳ, instead of τὸ ἀδ. τῷ νόμῳ. Of this latter combination, the passive ἀδύνατον and the genitive, no examples have been brought forward; for in all the passages quoted by Meyer in support of the passive sense, the active is evidently required.

Plato, ‘Hipp. Maj.’ p. 295, E: οὐκοῦν τὸ δυνατὸν (“that which is able”) ἔκαστον ἀπεργάζεσθαι, εἰς ὅπερ δυνατόν, εἰς τούτο καὶ χρηστόν, τὸ δὲ ἀδύνατον (“but that which is unable”) ἄχροπον.

Xen. ‘Hell.’ I. iv. 13: ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τῆς πόλεως δυνατοῦ (“from his own resources and from the ability of the city”): see Breitenbach’s note.

Epistle to Diognetus, c. ix. C. Ἐλέγξας . . . τὸ ἀδύνατον τῆς ἡμετέρας φύσεως εἰς τὸ τυχεῖν ζῶντος. The active sense is strongly confirmed by the similar phrase τὸ δυνατὸν αὐτοῦ in ix. 22.

With the active sense the construction may be thus explained: “For the impotence of the law being this, that it could not condemn sin in the flesh, God did condemn sin in the flesh,” &c.

b. ἐν φ., “*in that,*” A. V. a much better rendering than “because” (Alford). It points to that *in which* the inability of the law consists, namely in its being overpowered by the opposition of “*the flesh*” (vii. 14–18). Compare Plato, ‘Rep.’ V. p. 455: τὸν μὲν εὐφύτη πρός τι εἴναι τὸν δὲ ἀφνῆ ἐν φ. ὁ μὲν φάδιος τι μανθάνει, ὁ δέ χαλεπός.

c. ἐν ὥρισματι σαρκὸς ἀμάρτιας. The consistency of this expression with the reality and the sinlessness of Christ’s Flesh is ably defended by Tertullian (‘Contra Marcionem,’ V. 14; ‘De Carne Christi,’ xvi., xvii.), and

by Augustine, who shews how Christ's flesh was sinless on either hypothesis of Traducianism or Creatianism (Epist. 164).

This ancient interpretation, accepted even by Baur ('Paulus,' III. c. viii.), has been elaborately attacked by Pfleiderer as involving "two errors: a mistranslation of the word ὄμοιώμα, and an inadmissible separation of the two ideas σάρξ and ἀμαρτίας. As regards the first, it is beyond question, that if the words had merely been ἐν ὄμοιώματι σαρκός, no one would have hesitated to translate them simply 'in fleshly shape,' that is to say, in a shape or form of appearance which was the same as that of all human flesh, and in fact consisted of flesh" ('Paulinism,' I. p. 52).

In this bold assertion grammar and sense are alike put to confusion. The Objective Genitive is turned into a Genitive of the Material: σαρκός ἀμαρτίας "denotes" (we are told) "the material of which the human form of Christ, like that of other men, consists" (*ib.*).

If we apply this method to Deut. iv. 18, ὄμοιώμα παντὸς ἔπειροῦ, it will turn "*the graven image*" itself into "a creeping likeness;" and in Ps. cvi. 20 ἐν ὄμοιώματι μόρχου ἐσθίοντος χόρτον, the calf that Aaron made of gold becomes an actual living "calf that eateth hay."

We prefer the opinion of "most of the commentators, who explain the decisive passage in Rom. viii. 3 as if it meant that Christ appeared only in a 'likeness of sinful flesh,' that is to say, in a body which resembled indeed the body of other men so far as it consisted of flesh, but was unlike them in this respect that His flesh was not like that of all others, 'sinful flesh'" (*ib.*).

Other objections are urged both by Pfleiderer and Holsten:

(1.) The sinlessness of Christ's flesh directly contradicts this passage: for how could God have condemned "sin in the flesh" on the Cross of Christ, if Christ's flesh was not "flesh of sin"?

This objection rests wholly on the erroneous connexion of *ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ* noticed below in note e.

(2.) It is opposed to the whole development of thought from vi. 1 to viii. 3, which labours to prove that because man is in bondage to sin only through his flesh, he is delivered by the Cross of Christ just because it is the death of this very flesh of sin.

It is enough to answer that St. Paul nowhere attempts to prove that man is in bondage to sin only through his flesh.

(3.) St. Paul's whole anthropology recognises no flesh that is not flesh of sin.

This objection rests on the same groundless assumption as the preceding (2): see note on σάρξ, Introduction, § 9.

For a full discussion of Holsten's objections and of the whole subject, see Wendt, 'Fleisch und Geist.'

d. καὶ περὶ ἀμαρτίας. Chrysostom and others, disregarding καὶ, connect these words with κατέκρινεν, in the sense "condemned sin for sin," i. e. as being exceeding sinful.

All the English Versions in Bagster's Hexapla (except Geneva) give the same connexion, the A. V. 1611 being punctuated (as it is in a chained copy at Walgrave) thus: "and for sinne condemned sin in the flesh;" with the marginal rendering, "and by a sacrifice for sin," which corresponds with Origen's interpretation.

The proper connexion with πέμψας is given by Theophylact, Gennadius, Photius, and others in Cramer's 'Catena,' with the interpretations "because of sin's mastery over mankind," or "in order to conquer sin." The more comprehensive rendering "on account of sin" (propter peccatum) is preferable.

e. The words τὴν ἀμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ might possibly be taken as forming one idea, "the sin that was in the flesh," as τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον (vi. 4): see Winer, p. 169.

But the words *ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ* in this construction only give a definition of sin which is not needed in this context after σαρκὸς ἀμαρτίας, whereas if joined with κατέκρινεν they are full of significance.

It remains to be determined *in what flesh* sin was condemned, and *how?* The answers are various.

i. *Origen.* In Christ's flesh, considered as a sin-offering which put away sin (Heb. ix. 26).

ii. *Gennadius,* in Cramer's 'Catena,' p. 123.

(a) In Christ's flesh, as having been kept free from sin, and unconquered by it.

(b) In Christ's flesh God condemned sin of sin (περὶ ἀμαρτίας, de peccato), because it unjustly involved Christ's sinless flesh in death.

All these interpretations would require *ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ* to distinguish Christ's flesh from that which has been twice before mentioned, διὰ τῆς σαρκός, and σαρκὸς ἀμαρτίας. They err, however, only in substituting the more limited sense "his flesh" for the more general "the flesh." Christ's holy life "condemned sin" as unworthy to exist "in the flesh" which He and all men had in common: compare Irenaeus, III. xx. 2.

9. Though *εἶπεν* implies a more confident assumption than *εἶπε*, it cannot possibly mean "since" (*εἰπεῖτε*, Chrysostom), for that would exclude the opposite supposition which is expressly brought forward in the following clause, *εἰ δέ τις πνεῖ μά Χριστὸν οὐκ ἔχει*. The assumption made in either case

may or may not correspond to the existing fact, not because the fact is itself *contingent*, but because it is *unknown* to the speaker.

This uncertainty of the assumption is fully expressed in “*if so be*,” and the Subjunctive ought not to be repeated in the Verb “*dwell*,” for in the original the Indicative Present (*oikei*, *oikē* ἔχει) represents not *an uncertain contingency*, but that which, according to the assumption, is already *an existing fact*. Wyclif’s rendering “*dwelleteth*,” “*hath*,” is therefore more correct than the A. V. “*dwell*,” “*bave*,” derived from Tyndale. In defending the Subjunctive, Bp. Ellicott (‘On the Revision,’ p. 175) fails to distinguish between *uncertainty in the assumption*, and *contingency in the fact assumed*: the case is contemplated, according to the hypothesis, as actually in existence.

11. In the Dialogues on the Holy Trinity, ascribed to Maximus, the Greek monk and confessor (A. D. 580-662), Orthodoxus, being challenged to prove that as the Father raises the dead and quickens them (*ζωποιεῖ*), so also do the Son and Holy Ghost, quotes this passage with the reading *διὰ τὸν ἐνοικοῦντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος*. Macedonius replies that the reading is *διὰ τὸ ἐνοικοῦν*, except perhaps in one or two falsified copies. Orthodoxus asserts that the genitive is found in all the ancient copies, but, as this is considered by Macedonius to be a disputed point, passes on to a different argument.

This imaginary conversation only proves that in the 7th century the reading of the passage had long been in dispute, a fact of which we have abundant evidence of much earlier date. The genitive is found in A C, in many cursives, and some early versions, and Fathers. But this testimony is outweighed by that of other uncials and cursives, of the Italic and Syriac versions, and of the earlier Fathers, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, Methodius.

This preponderance of external testimony is supported by the internal evidence :

(1) The argument of the passage, as stated by Bp. Pearson himself (see foot-note), is inconclusive, unless we substitute the reading “*because of his Spirit that dwelleth in you*”: for it is nowhere implied in the premisses that Christ was raised up “*by the Spirit*.”

(2) The resurrection is ascribed in the N. T. to God in general, or to the Father, or to the Son (John v. 21; vi. 39; xi. 25), but not to the Holy Ghost in particular.

(3) The genitive is more likely than the accusative to have been introduced for its dogmatic import, as proving the personality of the Holy Ghost.

It should, however, be observed that the accusative represents the indwelling Spirit not only as the condition, but as the cause of true vitality.

28. πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθὸν [ό Θεός]. Though supported by good authority (A. B. Athiopic) ού Θεός is probably a gloss: both the form of the sentence and the sense are better without it.

The meaning of *συνεργεῖ*, “work together, one with another,” preferred by Estius, Bengel, Reiche, and Alford, seems to have been rejected by other interpreters without sufficient reason. The Verb has this sense not only in the phrases *συνεργεῦν ἀλλήλουν* (Xenoph. ‘Memor. Socr.’ II. iii. 88) *συνεργεῖν ἑαυτοῖς* (*ib.* III. v. 16), but also when there is no Dative expressed as in the passage of Diogenes Laertius (vii. 10+) quoted by Fritzsche, διχῶς λέγεσθαι τὰ ἀδιάφορα· ἀπαξ μὲν τὰ μῆτε πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν μῆτε πρὸς κακοδαιμονίαν συνεργοῦντα. Compare Polybius, XI. ix. 1, where *συνεργεῖν* is quite synonymous with *συμβάλλεσθαι*.

29. The word *προορίζω*, not found in classical writers nor in the LXX, is always in the N. T. accompanied by words which indicate the end and aim of the predestination.

This aim is here expressed in the adjective *συμμόρφων*, a secondary predicate used proleptically as in Phil. iii. 21, where the words *εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτό* are a gloss added to explain the construction. For the use of *συμμόρφων* with the genitive, see Bernhardy, ‘Syntax,’ p. 163; Matt. ‘G. Gr.’ § 379, obs. 2.

35. For τοῦ Χριστοῦ B κ and some cursives read τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, a manifest interpolation from v. 39, and an undeniable instance in which the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS. combine in giving a wrong reading. Compare Additional Note on v. 2.

## CHAPTER IX.

**I** Paul is sorry for the Jews. 7 All the seed of Abraham were not the children of the promise. 18 God hath mercy upon whom he will. 21 The potter may do with his clay what he list. 25 The calling of the Gentiles and rejecting of the Jews were foretold. 32 The cause why so few Jews embraced the righteousness of faith.

**I** SAY the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost,

## CHAPTERS IX.-XI. ISRAEL'S UNBELIEF, REJECTION, AND FUTURE RESTORATION.

The argument that the Gospel "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth" (i. 16—viii. 39) closes in a strain of triumphant thanksgiving.

But with all the Apostle's joy in Christ's salvation there is mingled a great and unceasing sorrow. For in stating the theme of his great argument (i. 16) St. Paul had spoken of a "salvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." Why then have his brethren and kinsmen according to the flesh so little share in this salvation? Where is the promise that was made to the Jew first? In treating this subject St. Paul, after a fervent protestation of love and sorrow for his own people, (ix. 1-5) declares that the cause of their rejection is not a failure of God's promise to the chosen people Israel (6-13), nor any injustice in God (14-29), but their own rejection of "the righteousness of God by faith" (ix. 30—x. 21). Consolation is found in the salvation of a "remnant according to election of grace" (xi. 1-10), in the present acceptance of the Gentiles (11-22), and the future restoration of Israel (23-32), all which are proofs of the wisdom and glory of God (33-36).

## CHAP. IX. 1-5. MOURNING OVER ISRAEL.

The sudden transition from triumphant joy to the keenest sorrow is made more striking by the absence of any connecting particle. But the direct connexion of thought with viii. 28-32 is evident. If the Gospel brings sure salvation to God's elect, why is His chosen people Israel not found among the heirs of this salvation?

**I** say the truth in Christ, I lie not. I speak truth, &c. Compare 1 Tim. ii. 7. St. Paul's conflicts with Jews and Judaizers might cast doubt upon his love to his own nation. Hence he affirms the sincerity of his sorrow for them with the assurance that he speaks with all the truthfulness of one who

**2** That I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart.

**3** For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my <sup>1 Or,</sup> brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh:

**4** Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the <sup>1 Or, tes-</sup> giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises;

feels that he is living and acting "*in Christ*" (Eph. iv. 17; 1 Thess. iv. 1), and for whom it is therefore impossible to lie (Col. iii. 9; Eph. iv. 15).

*my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost.]* Rather, *my conscience bearing witness with me.* The Holy Ghost is "the Spirit of truth," and the witness of a conscience enlightened by Him and acting under His influence must be true. St. Paul's conscience bears witness with him, i.e. in accordance with his words, "*in the Holy Ghost*," and therefore in all the clearness of divine truth. See note on ἐγγιατρυπεῖν, ii. 15; viii. 16.

**2.** The truth so solemnly attested in v. 1 is now expressed twice, and with growing intensity,—"great grief to me," "unceasing sorrow to my heart."

**3.** *For I could wish.]* The form of expression (*ηὐχόμην*, literally "I was wishing" or "praying") implies a real but passing wish, not calmly weighed and deliberately retained, but already resigned as impracticable (Acts xxv. 22; Gal. iv. 20; see Winer, III. § xli. 2).

*that myself were accursed from Christ.]* When the Apostle brings himself to utter the cause of his grief, his intense love and sorrow for Israel burst forth in words which might well seem incredible. His solemn protestation (v. 1) was not unnecessary, even if his affection for his countrymen had never been doubted.

*accursed.]* The meaning of the word "anathema" (1 Cor. xii. 3, xvi. 22; Gal. i. 8, 9) is to be derived from its use by the LXX in Lev. xxvii. 28, 29: "Every devoted thing (*ἀνάθεμα*) is most holy unto the Lord. None devoted (*ἀνάθεμα*), which shall be devoted of men, shall be redeemed; but shall surely be put to death."

Here the doom of the devoted one, instead of the death of the body, is separation from Christ and from the salvation that is in Him.

Like Moses St. Paul, if it depended only on his love, would have given his own soul for his brethren's sake, "if so he might bring

5 Whose *are* the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ

*came*, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.

them to true righteousness and eternal life" (Grotius).

But is not such a wish unreasonable and even irreverent? It must seem so to those whose hearts beat with no stronger pulse than that of a prudent self-interest. It is a fervent outburst of unselfish love, that may not be coldly criticised and weighed and measured: it is close akin to the spirit of Christ's self-sacrifice, and to that "foolishness of God" which "*is wiser than men*."

"O mighty love, O unsurpassable perfection, the servant speaks boldly to his Lord, and begs remission for the people, or claims to be himself also blotted out with them" (Clemens Rom. i. 53).

4. *Wbo are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption.*] St. Paul's sorrow, springing from natural affection for his kinsmen according to the flesh, is deepened by another feeling, "inasmuch as they (*οἵτες*) are Israelites" to whom belong all the privileges of the ancient covenant, which are now perfected "*in the fulness of the blessing of the Gospel of Christ.*" How mournful then to see the heirs of the promise shut out from their inheritance!

First in the emphatic enumeration of the privileges of Israel is "*the adoption*," which was first announced in Egypt:—*Israel is my son, even my firstborn*" (Ex. iv. 22; Jer. xxxi. 9). To Israel only had God thus revealed Himself as a Father, until "*the adoption*" was perfected in Christ (viii. 14–17).

*the glory.*] "*The glory of the Lord*," which was seen on Sinai (Ex. xxiv. 16, 17), and filled the tabernacle, had the form of light or fire, covered at times by a cloud: see note on Ex. xl. 34. Israel alone had such a visible token of God's presence.

Such interpretations as "the national glory of Israel" (Fritzsche), or "the glory that will be theirs in the end of the world" (Reuss), are too vague to have place in an enumeration of the several distinguishing privileges of the Jews.

*and the covenants, and the giving of the law.*] In Gal. iv. 24 St. Paul speaks of "*two covenants, one from Mount Sinai:*" but here "*the giving of the law*," the one grand revelation of the will of Jehovah for the regulation of the national and personal life of His people, is distinguished from "*the covenants*" made at several times with the fathers from Abraham downwards. (2 Macc. viii. 15; Sap. xviii. 22; Sirach xliv. 11; Heb. xi. 13.) So St. Paul speaks in Eph. ii. 12 of "*the commonwealth of Israel*," a result of the giving of the law, and "*the covenants of the promise*," as distinct pri-

vileges of Israel from which other nations had been excluded. The singular, found in many MSS, may have arisen from a wish to obviate the mistake of referring the plural to the old and new covenants mentioned in Gal. iv. 24,

*the service of God.*] "*The service*" of the Tabernacle (compare Heb. ix. 1) was the only worship which God had appointed.

*the promises.*] These, as distinguished from "*the covenants*" upon which they are grounded, include the whole body of prophecies concerning Christ and His kingdom.

5. *the fathers.*] Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Acts iii. 13, vii. 32): to have sprung from such forefathers, was one of the most cherished privileges of Israel (2 Cor. xi. 22).

*and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came.*] The last and greatest privilege of the Israelites is that the Messiah, so far as His human nature is concerned, springs from their race. We must notice here the important distinctions so carefully expressed by St. Paul's words and even by their exact order: "and from whom came the Christ as concerning the flesh." Christ is not in the same sense as the Patriarchs the peculiar property of the Israelites, "whose (*λόγοι*) *are the fathers.*" He springs indeed from their race (*ἐξ Ἰου ὁ Χριστός*), but He "*is over all*," and not only is His Jewish origin thus contrasted with His universal supremacy, but it is also expressly limited to His human nature. The closing emphasis of the clause falls upon the words "*as concerning the flesh*," which point onward to their natural contrast in the other aspect of His Person, Who is "*God blessed for ever.*"

*who is over all, God blessed for ever.*] There is happily no variation in the MSS to cast any doubt upon the wording of this great passage. But its meaning depends on punctuation, and some modern critics adopt a different connexion. They assume that the words "*God over all*" are to be combined in this order as a title equivalent to "*most High God*," and asserting that St. Paul could not have applied this title to Christ, they deny that the clause refers to Him, and render it as a doxology: "*May the God who is over all be blessed for ever.*" To this interpretation there are strong objections on grounds which are stated in *the note at the end of the chapter.* Here it may be enough to say that it gives a most inappropriate sense. St. Paul is expressing the anguish of his heart at the fall of his brethren: that anguish is deepened by the memory of their privileges, most of all by

**6** Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect. For they *are* not all Israel, which are of Israel:

**7** Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, *are they* all children: but, <sup>c</sup>In Isaac shall thy seed be called.

**8** That is, They which are the

children of the flesh, these *are* not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.

**9** For this *is* the word of promise,

<sup>d</sup> At this time will I come, and Sarah <sup>e</sup>Gen. 18. 10. shall have a son.

the thought that their race gave birth to the Divine Saviour, whom they have rejected. In this, the usual interpretation, all is most natural: the last and greatest cause of sorrow is the climax of glory from which the chosen race has fallen.

But how could such a lamentation close in a doxology? How could the Apostle bless God that Christ was born a Jew, in his anguish that the Jews had rejected Him?

On the other hand the declaration that Christ "*is over all, God blessed for ever,*" is an opportune and noble protest against the indignity cast upon Him by the unbelief of the Jews. "For what, saith he, if others blaspheme? Yet we who know His unspeakable mysteries, and His ineffable wisdom, and His great providence, know that He is worthy not to be blasphemed but to be glorified" (Chrysostom).

#### 6-13. NO FAILURE OF GOD'S PROMISE.

St. Paul's lamentation over his brethren and kinsmen according to the flesh has no such meaning as that God's promise has failed, for that belonged not to all natural descendants of Abraham, but only to the chosen seed, the true Israel.

**6.** *Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect. For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel.]* "But not as though the word of God hath fallen to the ground: for not all they which are of Israel are Israel." "*The word of God*" is the promise given to Abraham and to his seed. This has not failed, for its principle from the first was not mere natural succession, but Divine election: not all who were sprung from the chosen people were therefore themselves the chosen people, true Israelites, heirs of the promise.

On this use of *οὐτος* see the note at the end.

**7.** *Neither because they are the seed of Abraham.]* "*Nor because they are Abraham's seed are they all children?*" i.e., children of Abraham in the fullest sense, as in viii. 17, "*if children, then heirs.*" St. Paul goes back to Abraham in order to discuss the case of his two sons, and to show that in the very first generation, the title of natural descent was limited and restricted by Divine election. In ratifying Sarah's claim that the

son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with her son, God says to Abraham (Gen. xxi. 12), "*In Isaac shall thy seed be called;*" i.e., the promised seed (Gen. xiii. 15, xv. 5, xvii. 7, 19); and then adds, "*and also of the son of the bondwoman will I make a nation, because he is thy seed.*" Thus in using the term "*seed of Abraham*" in a twofold sense, here and in other passages, St. Paul only adopts a distinction which belonged to the promise from the first.

**8.** *That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God.]* "*That is, Not the children of the flesh are thereby children of God.*" St. Paul interprets the text just quoted, by drawing out the general principle involved in the particular case of Ishmael the child of the flesh, and Isaac the child of promise. According to the A. V. none of "*the children of the flesh*" are "*children of God*:" in other words "*the children of the flesh*" do not include all the descendants of Abraham, but only those who are "*children of the flesh*" and nothing more. But the Greek idiom absolutely requires a different meaning, which we have tried to express above. The true "*children*" of Abraham are "*children of God*" by virtue of the adoption, v. 4. But *who* are these? Not "*the children of the flesh*" as such. See Note at end.

*but the children of the promise.]* This does not mean simply the promised children, but as Chrysostom says of Isaac, "It was not the power of the flesh, but *the strength of the promise* that gave birth to the child." It would be equally true to say that the child was begotten in *the strength of faith*, but the argument requires the Divine, not the human, side to be made prominent. It is not Abraham's fatherhood that determines the true seed, but that promise which was the expression of God's free electing grace. It is clear from Gal. iv. 28 that "*the children of the promise*" correspond, in the Apostle's mind, to believers, whether Jew or Gentile, and "*the children of the flesh*" to the unbelieving Jews.

*are counted for the seed.]* And therefore really are what they are by God accounted: compare iv. 5, and note there.

**9.** *For this is the word of promise.]* St. Paul confirms his statement by God's words to Abraham in Gen. xviii. 14. "*The children,*"

10 And not only *this*; but when stand, not of works, but of him that Rebecca also had conceived by one, calleth;)

*even by our father Isaac;*

11 (For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might

I say, "of the promise," "for this word is (a word) of promise."

*At this time.] According to this season:* see note on Gen. xviii. 10.

10. *And not only this.]* Translate: "And not only she, but Rebecca also, when she had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac." The construction is incomplete, but the sense is clear. Not only Sarah received a promise from God, which limited the true seed of Abraham to her son: but in the next generation Rebecca also received a promise, in which the same principle of Divine election is still more strikingly proved.

Isaac, it might be said, was the only child of Abraham by his wife, "*the free woman*" (Gal. iv. 22), and so the only proper heir: but Esau and Jacob were *twin* children of *one father*, which is expressly mentioned in order to exclude all possibility of difference in parentage. Abraham's sons had only *one* common parent, Rebecca's have *both*.

*even by our father Isaac.]* The twins had for their common father the patriarch of the chosen race: and yet even in this case one of them, and he the first-born, was excluded. This case comes home more fully to the Jews than the rejection of the slave-born Ishmael.

11. (*For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth;*)] The parenthesis is not only useless, but destroys the connection with the following verse. The conditional negatives ( $\mu\eta\nu\pi\omega$ ,  $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon$ ) represent the circumstances not as mere facts of history, but as conditions entering into God's counsel and plan. The time of the prediction was thus chosen, in order to make it clear that He who calls men to be heirs of His salvation makes free choice of whom He will, unfettered by any claims of birth or merit. Such absolute freedom is the rightful prerogative of Him, who is alone All-wise and All-good. The order of the clauses is very significant: the time chosen for the prediction to Rebecca is mentioned first—"while the children were not yet born, nor had done aught good or evil;" then the Divine counsel in choosing this time, "*that the purpose of God according to election might stand not dependent on works but on him that calleth;*"

stand, not of works, but of him that calleth;)

12 It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger.

13 As it is written, <sup>a</sup>*Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.*

14 What shall we say then? *Is* <sup>b</sup>*Mal. i. 2.*

<sup>a</sup> Gen. 25

<sup>b</sup> Or,

<sup>c</sup> Or,

<sup>d</sup> Or,

<sup>e</sup> Lesser.

<sup>f</sup> Mal. 1. 2.

dent on works but on him that calleth; and last the principal sentence, "it was said unto her, *The elder shall serve the younger.*"

*might stand]* Literally, "might remain."

The Present Tense extends this continuance even to the Apostle's own generation, in which the principle was again so signally and so sadly exemplified.

12, 13. *The elder shall serve the younger.]* The whole passage in Gen. xxv. 23 is as follows: "Two nations are in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels: and the one people shall be stronger than the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger."

This prediction, St. Paul says, agrees with what is written in Malachi i. 2: "I have loved you, saith the Lord. Yet ye say, Wherein hast thou loved us? Was not Esau Jacob's brother? saith the Lord: yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste."

(1.) From the context of both passages it is clear that Esau and Jacob are regarded as two nations, and it is an arbitrary assumption to say that Malachi intends not the two nations, Edom and Israel, but the persons of the two brothers.

(2.) But it is also clear from the words "while they were not yet born," v. 11, that St. Paul regards them as individual persons.

(3.) The explanation, which combines both views, is that the choice of the nation is included in the choice of its founder, and the original passages refer to God's election of *Jacob and his descendants* to be the depositaries of His truth and the channels of His grace. What St. Paul shows is, that the election to these privileges was not dependent on any personal merit of the founder.

*Esau have I hated.]* See the notes on Malachi i. 3. The love and the hate, as contemplated by St. Paul, are shown in God's choosing the younger to inherit the Messianic promise, and excluding the elder.

The exaggerated sense of "positive hate" which Meyer assigns to *ἐπιστορεῖ* is quite forbidden by the record of the ample blessing bestowed on Esau.

14-18. NO INJUSTICE IN GOD.  
Having shown from the history of the

*there unrighteousness with God?*  
God forbid.

<sup>Ex. 33. 14.</sup> 15 For he saith to Moses, ‘I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion.

Patriarchs that the present exclusion of the Jews from Christ's kingdom does not imply a failure of God's promise, St. Paul now proceeds to prove that it cannot be ascribed to injustice in God.

The rejection of Ishmael and Esau with their descendants, and the choice of Israel to inherit the promised blessing, were examples of God's electing grace, which a Jew would heartily approve. But what if these examples involved a principle that would justify the exclusion of the unbelieving Jew himself? To such a conclusion, clearly implied in v. 11, objection would at once be made.

14. *What shall we say then?*] From the account given in vv. 11–13 of the choice of Jacob and rejection of Esau before they had done either good or evil, the question naturally arises “*Is there injustice in God?*” that He thus chooses one and rejects another without regard to their works? “The Jewish conscience, developed under the Law, was accustomed to consider the conduct of God towards man as depending entirely on the merit or demerit of his works” (Godet). The ground on which St. Paul rejects the thought of injustice is remarkable. His answer is simply an appeal to the testimony of Holy Scripture that God *does* exercise His mercy with absolute freedom of choice: the force therefore of his argument rests wholly on the very principle presupposed in the objection, “God cannot be unjust.” Neither the truth of this axiom nor the authority of Scripture could be questioned by a Jew. For a similar argument, and for the form of the question, in which the negative answer is already implied, see iii. 5 and note.

15. *For he saith to Moses.] For to Moses he saith.* The order of the words is emphatic. “It was necessary to mention Moses, in order to show the certainty of the statement by the persons both of Him who spake and of him who heard” (Theodoret). But more than this is implied: if to *Moses* God's favour was absolutely free and unmerited, how much more to others!

*I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy.] Ex. xxxiii. 19:* where “these words, though only connected with the previous clause by the copulative Vau, are to be understood in a causal sense as expressing the reason why Moses' request was granted,

16 So then *it is not of him that willeteth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.*

17 For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, <sup>Ex. 9.</sup> Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I

namely, that it was an act of unconditional grace and compassion on the part of God, to which no man, not even Moses, could lay any just claim” (Keil and Delitzsch).

See the note at the end of the chapter on other interpretations.

16. *So then it is not of him that willeteth.*] The inference from God's words to Moses is, that the bestowal of the Divine mercy depends not on man's will or man's effort, but simply on “*God that sheweth mercy.*” He chooses whom He will, and on what conditions He will. His grace is a free gift, not a debt: it calls out man's will and effort, but is not predetermined by them (Phil. ii. 13). For the expression “*him that runneth*” compare 1 Cor. ix. 24–26.

17. St. Paul appeals again to Scripture to prove as a fact that God does reject, as well as choose, whomsoever He will. It is still presupposed, as in v. 14, that “God cannot be unjust;” if Holy Scripture testifies that “*he bath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will be hardoneth,*” then this must be true, and it must also be consistent with God's justice. The fact is first shown from Scripture (vv. 17–18), and then its justice is discussed (vv. 19–24).

*Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up.*] Rather “*for this very purpose,*” &c.

The sense of the passage as understood by the LXX is as follows: “For this purpose I have upheld thee, and preserved thy life, that I might show my power in thee by a long series of warnings and chastisements, followed by a final great overthrow, more strikingly than it could have been shown by thy immediate destruction.” This interpretation represents fairly, though not precisely, the general meaning of the Hebrew, and being not unsuited to the present stage of St. Paul's argument, is adopted by him, with the following slight but very important variation.

For *iva*, which expresses the direct and primary purpose, “in order that,” St. Paul substitutes *ōrōs* denoting the more remote and secondary purpose, “that so.”

Thus the exhibition of God's power upon Pharaoh appears only as the secondary purpose, consequent on his refusal to yield to God's direct will, “Let my people go.”

The more exact meaning of the passage

might shew my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth.

18 Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.

19 Thou wilt say then unto me,

(Ex. ix. 16) is recognised by St. Paul at a later stage of his argument (v. 22).

Compare notes on Ex. ix. 16, and for a full discussion of this most important and much misunderstood passage, see note at the end of this chapter.

18. A double inference from the two passages cited in vv. 15–17.

*Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy.]* “So then on whom he will hath he mercy.” The freedom of the Divine choice is strongly marked by the emphatic position of the relative clause: compare v. 15.

*and whom he will be hardened.*] In Exodus the hardening is ascribed to God in the prediction, iv. 21 and vii. 3; in the first seven plagues it is regarded as Pharaoh's own doing, and in the last three, as God's judicial hardening: see Dean Jackson, ix. 394, 399, 400, 407, 408, 458. St. Paul here has to do with the *event* only, and not with the *process*, as his purpose is to bring forward other *events*, parallel to the rejection of the Jews. On the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, see Origen, ‘De Principiis,’ III. i. 10, where he shows that by one and the same operation God has mercy upon one man, and hardens another, because the heart of those who treat his kindness and forbearance with contempt is hardened by the delay of their punishment, while those who make his goodness and patience an occasion of repentance, find mercy.

The argument of the whole passage (14–18) may be summed up briefly thus:

The case of Esau and Jacob shows that man can discern no reason why God chooses one and rejects another. But it does not follow that God is unjust. Hear what He said to Moses: “I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy.” Is it unjust that mercy should do good where it will? Look at Pharaoh: if we could see no reason why God hardened his heart, and made him a tragical example of His severity, should we call that severity unjust? God forbid.

#### 19–21. GOD'S ABSOLUTE POWER ASSERTED.

So far St. Paul has repelled the objection to God's justice, without attempting to explain the difficulty involved in it: and he knows that the same difficulty will rise up again in a different form.

Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will?

20 Nay but, O man, who art thou that <sup>1</sup>repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?

21 Hath not the <sup>1</sup>potter power

[*Thou wilt say then unto me.*] “Thou wilt say to me then.” Against the statement, “whom he will be hardened,” this objection may be raised: “If God Himself hardens the heart, why does He yet find fault with man? What justice is there in continuing to lay the blame on a creature who goes on sinning because God so wills and he cannot resist?” The objection, though expressed in general terms, has its historical ground in the reproaches and expostulations which God continues to address to Pharaoh in Ex. ix. 17, “As yet exaltest thou thyself against my people, that thou wilt not let them go?” and in x. 3, 4, “How long wilt thou refuse to humble thyself before Me?” (Jackson, ‘On the Creed,’ 458.)

St. Paul assumes that the same objection will be made as an excuse for the unbelief of Israel. If God has chosen to harden their hearts, how can He justly lay the blame on them?

*For who bath resisted his will?*] The question expresses in a livelier form, the general truth that God's will is irresistible.

It is important to notice the word here used for “will” (*βούλημα*): but this and other cautions needed in interpreting the clause are thrown into the note at the end of the chapter, in order to leave the Apostle's argument free from interruption.

The brief and peremptory questions have a tone of discontent and presumption, which is met in v. 20 by a stern rebuke: explanation follows later in v. 22.

20. *Nay but, O man, who art thou . . . ?* St. Paul repels the objection, “Why doth he yet find fault?” by rebuking the presumption of feeble man in thus “replying against God.” The marginal renderings, “answerest again,” or “disputest with God” are not so good as the A. V. “repliest (or makest answer) against God;” compare Job xxxii. 12; Luke xiv. 6; and for the like disparaging question, see xiv. 4, and Plato, ‘Gorgias,’ p. 452, b. “Magnifici doctoris severitate deterret, cum dicit, O homo, tu quis es?” Origen, ‘In Exodum Hom.’ iv. 2.

*Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?*] This figure of the potter and his vessel is derived originally from the account of the creation of man

over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?

22 *What if God, willing to shew*

**in Gen. ii. 7, whence were derived the term "protoplasm" applied to Adam by the LXX Wisdom vii. 1), and "plasma" as a description of man compare Ps. ciii. 14, and 1 Tim. ii. 13.**

Here St. Paul, quoting from Isaiah and Jeremiah, justifies God's rejection of the Jews in the very words of the Prophets who predicted it. See Is. xxix. 16, which is rendered by the LXX thus: "Shall ye not be counted as the potter's clay? Shall the thing formed (*τὸ πλαίσμα*) say to him that formed it, Thou formedst me not? Or the thing made to him that made it, Thou madest me not wisely? Compare Is. xlvi. 9: "Shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it, What makest thou?" See also Is. lxiv. 8.

What makes the Prophet's language so exactly appropriate to the Apostle's argument is, that they are both dealing with the same subject, namely, God's formation of Israel as a nation, and His consequent unquestionable right to deal with it as seems good to Him.

21. *Hath not the potter power over the clay, &c.] "Or bath not," &c.* This is the alternative to the argument of v. 20: either you must admit that Israel is incompetent to question God's dealings, or you must say that the potter hath not power over the clay. St. Paul refers to Jer. xviii. 4-6, where see notes, and observe the heading of the chapter: "*Under the type of a potter is shewed God's absolute power in disposing of nations.*" In v. 6 we read: "*O house of Israel, cannot I do with you as this potter? saith the Lord. Behold, as the clay is in the potter's hand, so are ye in mine hand, O house of Israel.*" The passage is the more remarkable because the declaration that God is as free to do what He will with Israel as the potter with the clay, is followed immediately (vv. 7-10) by the promise that the exercise of this absolute power shall be allowed to depend on the penitence or impenitence of the nation. St. Paul, in vv. 22, 23, shows how this promise had been fulfilled in God's long-suffering towards Israel.

*of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour and another unto dishonour?]* Here we have a distinct allusion to the language of Wisdom xv. 7, 8, but the application is totally different. The subject there is the folly of idol worship, as shown by the power of the potter to make a vain god out of the same clay, of which "*he maketh both the vessels that*

*his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted <sup>made up</sup> to destruction:*

*serve for clean uses, and likewise also such as serve to the contrary."*

By St. Paul this distinction between "*one vessel unto honour and another unto dishonour*" is applied, like the rest of the figure of which it forms part, to God's absolute freedom in dealing with one nation and another. "*The same lump of clay*" represents mankind as a whole. Shall Israel say to his Maker, Thou hast no right to make of me anything else than a vessel unto honour, and Thou hast no right to make of the Gentiles anything but a vessel unto dishonour? (Godet). This reference of the passage to national, not individual, election is required by the whole purpose of St. Paul's argument, and placed beyond doubt by vv. 24-26. Compare Ecclesiasticus xxxiii. 10-12: "All men are from the ground, and Adam was created of earth. In much knowledge the Lord hath divided them, and made their ways diverse. Some of them hath he blessed and exalted, and some of them hath he sanctified and set near himself; but some of them hath he cursed and brought low, and turned out of their places. As the clay is in the potter's hand, to fashion it at his pleasure: so man is in the hand of him that made him, to render to them as liketh him best."

#### 22-24. GOD'S JUSTICE AND MERCY VINDICATED.

22. After having asserted God's unquestionable right to do with His creatures whatever seems best to His Godly wisdom, St. Paul now passes on to justify the actual course of His dealing. This justification consists in the fact of God's long-suffering, with its two-fold motive of judgment and mercy.

*What if God?]* Literally, "But if God." The sentence is unfinished, but its meaning is easily completed: "But if God in fact showed much long-suffering, what further objection can you make against His justice?" We may express it more briefly, thus: "But what if God," &c.

For similar examples of sentences beginning with *εἰ δέ*, and left incomplete, see Acts xxiii. 9, and Winer, 'Grammar,' § 64. *But* (*δέ*) marks the contrast between God's absolute right and His actual long-suffering; see note on ii. 17-24.

The whole argument is very like that of Wisdom xi. xii.: see especially xii. 2. "*Therefore chastenest thou them by little and little that offend, and warnest them by putting them in remembrance wherein they have offended,*

23 And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the

vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory,

*that leaving their wickedness, they may believe on Thee, O Lord:*" and v. 26, "But they that would not be reformed by that correction, where-in he dallied with them (παγύριον ἐντυμήσεως) shall feel a judgment worthy of God." The position is no longer that of God's *absolute right*, but of His actual dealing.

Vv. 22, 23 are St. Paul's interpretation and generalised application of the passage concerning Pharaoh quoted in v. 17, and the quotation and the comment help to explain each other.

(1.) The comment, "*endured with much long-suffering*," shows that St. Paul's version, "*I have raised thee up*" has the same sense as the Hebrew and LXX, namely, "*I have sustained and upheld thee*," correcting only the grammatical form of διετηρήθης, "*thou wast preserved*."

(2.) Again the words "*for this very purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power*," make it certain, that when St. Paul writes "*God willing to show*," he means "*because He willed*" and not "*although He willed*."

The desire "*to show his wrath and to make his power known*," was not a hindrance to His forbearance (as Meyer regards it), but a motive to it; a motive too acting throughout the long series of warnings and judgments, and not limited to the final catastrophe. See Ex. vii. 5, 17; viii. 10, 22; ix. 14, 29. St. Paul's interpretation thus agrees exactly with the true and full sense of the original "*for to show thee my power*;" and it is equally applicable to either case, the destruction of Pharaoh, or the rejection of Israel, in both of which God's "*much long-suffering*," resulted, through their own obstinacy, in making the "*vessels of wrath*" more conspicuous objects of His avenging power.

See the note at the end of the chapter on v. 17.

*his power.*] τὸ δύνατόν αὐτοῦ, corresponding to "*my power*" (τὴν δύναμίν μον) v. 17: compare note on viii. 3, "*What the law could not do.*"

*the vessels of wrath.*] "*vessels of wrath*," without the Definite Article. Though his language is still full of allusions to the previous passage (vv. 17-21), St. Paul has now passed from the particular example of the hardening of Pharaoh to the general principle which connects it with his immediate subject, the rejection of Israel.

The word "*vessel*," taken from the figure of the potter (v. 21), implies some kind of use which the vessel is to serve: thus "*vessels of wrath*," and "*vessels of mercy*" are such

as fitly serve God's purpose of showing His wrath and His mercy. Compare Jer. l. 25; Ps. ii. 9.

"*fitted for destruction*," i. e. fully prepared and worthy: compare Wisdom xii. 20, ὀφειλομένους θανάτῳ, "*condemned to death*." The Passive Participle does not define how, or by whom, the vessels of wrath have been thus prepared. "Pharaoh was fitted by himself and his own doing" (Chrysostom): "*fitted by the potter*" (Van Hengel): "He who has fitted them for destruction is God" (Meyer): all these views are too narrow and exclusive. We have passed from the view of God's absolute power (19-21) to that of His actual dealing with His creatures, and God does not in fact fit man, nor the potter his vessel, for destruction. Both factors, God's probationary judgments, and man's perverse will, conduce to the result, and it is the result only that is here expressed by the Participle.

The description "*vessels of wrath fitted for destruction*" was eminently applicable to the mass of the Jewish nation in St. Paul's day: "*they please not God, and are contrary to all men; forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway; for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost*" (1 Thess. ii. 15, 16).

23. *And that he might make known the riches of his glory.*] This is a direct and primary purpose (*iva*) of God's long-suffering towards "*vessels of wrath*."

"*The glory*" of God is, in general, the manifestation of the Divine perfections (see on v. 2), and, in this context, more especially the manifestation of His goodness and mercy (Ex. xxxiii. 18, 19): and "*the riches of his glory*" (Eph. i. 18; iii. 16; Col. i. 27) is that inexhaustible wealth of goodness which embraces all "*vessels of mercy*" in the fulness of blessing.

"*Salvation is of the Jews*" (John iv. 22), and therefore the chosen race, notwithstanding all its transgressions, is preserved, in order that the promised salvation may embrace in its accomplishment both the remnant of Israel and the fulness of the Gentiles.

Compare Wisdom xii. 19-22: "Thou mayest use power when thou wilt. But by such works hast thou taught thy people that the just man should be merciful, and hast made thy children to be of a good hope that thou givest repentance for sins. For if thou didst punish the enemies of thy children, and the condemned to death, *with such deliberation*, giving them time and place, whereby they might be delivered from their malice; with how great circumspection didst thou judge

<sup>✓ Hos. 2.  
23. 1 Pet.  
2. 10.</sup> 24 Even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles?

25 As he saith also in Osee, I will call them my people, which were

not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved,

26 <sup>h</sup> And it shall come to pass, <sup>A Hos. 1.</sup>  
<sup>ta.</sup> that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people;

thine own sons, unto whose fathers thou hast sworn and made covenants of good promises?"

[which be bad afore prepared unto glory.] Comparing this with the parallel clause, we see—

(1.) That St. Paul is here speaking not of election or predestination, but of an actual preparation and purgation undergone by vessels of mercy to fit them for glory, before God "makes known the riches of his glory upon them." Compare 2 Tim. ii. 20, 21, a passage which evidently looks back on this.

(2.) We observe that this preparation, unlike that by which "vessels of wrath" are "fitted for destruction," is ascribed directly and exclusively to God as its author, being wholly brought about by His Providence and preventient grace. The idea of fitness, akin to that of desert, is ascribed only to the vessels of wrath: see note on v. 22.

The vessels of mercy God has made ready for glory, but there is no idea of merit involved.

24. Even us, whom he hath called, &c.] Read "whom he did also call in us, not only from among Jews, but also from among Gentiles." For the apposition οὐσι—ηγάνας compare Eur. 'Iph. Taur.' 63; Bernhardy, Synt. p. 302.

We here see that the preparation mentioned in v. 23 preceded the actual call.

It is thus identified with the whole course of discipline and grace by which God prepared among both Jews and Gentiles a people to be called into His kingdom. Compare Luke i. 17; and Rom. ii. 14, 15.

Thus in the actual call God began to fulfil His purpose of "making known the riches of his glory on vessels of mercy:" and this He did the more conspicuously by calling Heathen as well as Jews.

#### 25-29. THE CALLING OF THE GENTILES AND THE REJECTION OF THE JEWS FORETOLD IN PROPHECY.

25. I will call them my people, which were not my people, and her beloved which was not beloved.] "I will call that my people which was not my people," &c. Hos. ii. 23, quoted freely from the LXX, the order of the two sentences being inverted.

The inference which St. Paul means to draw from the quotation is variously understood.

(1.) The promised restoration of apostate Israel may be regarded as a proof that the calling both of Jews and Gentiles (v. 24) is a free gift of God's grace to those who had no title to it in their previous condition (Hofmann: see note on Hos. i. 10).

(2) Chrysostom constructs an argument *à fortiori*. If Israel, after all its ingratitude, abuse of privileges, and apostasy, was yet to be restored, much more the Heathen, who never had such privileges to abuse.

But (3) the Hebrew means literally: "I will have mercy on Lo-ruhamah, and to Lo-ammi I will say, Ammi art thou."

Now these names both designate the Ten Tribes only, exclusive of Judah (Hos. i. 7), and mean that Israel has become like the Heathen, who are not God's people.

The promise of Israel's restoration therefore includes, either by parity of reason or as a typical prophecy, the calling of the Gentiles, to which St. Paul here applies it. See the treatise among Leo's works, "On the calling of all nations," Lib. II. c. xviii.

This interpretation is confirmed by the inversion of the two parallel clauses, by which St. Paul brings "Lo-ammi" into immediate connection with "the Gentiles." So God's mercies again overflow His threatenings. . . . In reversing His sentence [on Israel] He embraces in the arms of His mercy all who were not His people" (Pusey on Hos. ii. 23).

26. The whole verse is quoted exactly from the LXX of Hos. i. 10, and is joined by St. Paul to the former passage "as forming one connected declaration" (Meyer).

"The place where it was said to them, Ye are not my people," is not Palestine, where the prediction was first uttered, but "the land of exile, where the name became an actual truth" (Keil and Hengstenb.).

"The place of their rejection, the Dispersion, was to be the place of their restoration" (Pusey).

This is certain from Hos. i. 11, where the restoration to God's favour precedes the return from the land of exile. St. Paul, therefore, is in full agreement with the Prophet as to the place intended. It is true for the Dispersion of Israel (1 Pet. i. 1, ii. 10), the typical Lo-ammi, and for all who in times past were not the people of God, that wherever they are brought to faith in Christ, "there shall they be called sons of the living God" See on Hos. i. 10.

there shall they be called the children of the living God.

27 Esaias also crieth concerning Israel, *'Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved:*

28 For he will finish *'the work,*

<sup>¶</sup> Is. 10.  
22, 23.

<sup>¶</sup> Or, the account.

27. St. Paul now passes over (*δέ*) from prophecies applicable to the calling of the Gentiles to others concerning the exclusion of all but a remnant of the Jews: the context of Hos. i. 10 naturally suggesting the repetition of the same prediction by Isaiah.

*Esaias also crieth concerning Israel.]* “**But Esaias crieth for Israel**” (Wyclif). The prophet’s cry is addressed to God (Is. x. 22) as an earnest pleading of His promise: it is therefore a cry of intercession, “as if it were the Spirit of adoption ‘crying out’ in him” (viii. 15: see Note on Is. x. 22). Godet’s idea, that Isaiah’s *cry* (*κράξει*) is the menacing tone of the herald proclaiming God’s judgment *upon* Israel, is entirely opposed to the meaning of the words and to the tenor of the context.

*Though the number of the children of Israel, &c.]* St. Paul here varies from the LXX of Is. x. 22, and goes back to the words of Hosea i. 10. The prophecy is of course founded on the Promise in Gen. xxii. 17, which it defines more closely.

*a remnant shall be saved.]* Read, “**The remnant**,” &c. This is the point of Isaiah’s prophecy, “Shear-jashub,” and is emphatically repeated in vv. 21, 22. It means that “*the remnant*” shall return not merely from the Captivity, but “*unto the mighty God*,” i.e. Messiah: compare Is. ix. 6 and x. 21, and notes there. It is therefore a distinct prediction that “*the remnant shall be saved*” in Christ.

28. *For he will finish the work, and cut it short in righteousness.]* “**For a word he finisheth, and cutteth short in righteousness.**” On the exact meaning of the Hebrew, see Notes on Isaiah.

St. Paul retains the words of the LXX, which give a meaning far from exact, yet not opposed to the original, and in itself true and sufficient for the present purpose.

It is a general characteristic of God, that any work of His he accomplishes and cuts short with summary justice. (Compare Isa. xxviii. 22, and the LXX there.)

*because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth.]* “**For a short-cut word will**,” &c.

St. Paul still follows the LXX, but omits the less important details: this part of the

and cut *it* short in righteousness: because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth.

29 And as Esaias said before,<sup>¶</sup> Except the Lord of Sabaoth had left us a seed, we had been as Sodoma, and been made like unto Gomorrah.

quotation refers to God’s summary sentence upon Israel, in which the mass is rejected and only the remnant saved.

The abbreviated reading of the earliest MSS., adopted by Tischendorf (8) and Treagues, may be thus rendered: “*For finishing and cutting short word will the Lord perform it upon earth.*”

29. *And as Esaias said before, Except, &c.]* Read, *And, as Esaias hath said before, &c.* The Perfect denotes, as usual, what stands written in Scripture.

The Greek word (*προείρηκεν*) may mean either “hath foretold” (compare Acts i. 14, 1 Thess. iii. 6), or simply “hath said before” (1 Thess. iv. 6; 2 Cor. vii. 3, xiii. 2; Gal. i. 9).

In favour of the latter meaning it is argued that Isaiah’s words (i. 9) refer to the state of the people in his own time, and there is nothing in the context to indicate even a secondary prophetic sense.

We must suppose therefore, according to this view, that St. Paul simply makes Isaiah’s words his own, using them, not as a prediction fulfilled, but as a description applicable to the state of Israel in his own day: “*And, as Isaiah hath said before, so say I again in his words, except the Lord of Sabaoth had left us a seed, &c.*” The word “before” is also taken to mean “in an earlier passage.” (Alford).

The other meaning “hath foretold” is preferred by most commentators on Romans, the passage of Isaiah (i. 7–9) being regarded as a preface in which “the Prophet with a few ground strokes gathers up the whole future of the people of Israel” (Drechsler).

A decision, which must depend on the exact meaning of the original passage, belongs to a commentary on Isaiah, or a treatise on the nature of Prophecy, rather than to this note. The quotation is well suited to St. Paul’s argument, whether he uses it as a prophecy fulfilled, or merely as a description applicable to his own time.

*a seed.]* The Hebrew word rendered in Is. i. 9 “remnant” is not *שְׁנָצֵר* as in the prophecy of “Shear-jashub,” but *שְׁנָצֵר* as in Num. xxi. 35, xxiv. 19, Job xx. 21, &c., which denotes the few who escape and survive. This remnant the LXX regard as

30 What shall we say then? That the Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith.

31 But Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness.

"seed" (*σπέρμα*), from which the nation shall spring up again: compare Hos. ii. 23, Is. vi. 13.

*[we had been as Sodoma.] "We had become as Sodom," where no seed was left (Bengel). "Here again he points out another circumstance, that not even the small remnant escaped of themselves, but would all have perished, had not God in great mercy saved them by faith" (Chrysost.).*

30. *What shall we say then?]* What conclusion shall we draw from this view of God's dealings? The answer consists of two parts: (1) a statement of facts (30, 31) drawn from the whole preceding discussion in vv. 6-29, and expressed as a striking paradox: and (2) a declaration of the cause (vv. 32, 33), by which the paradox in the case of the Jews is explained.

*[That the Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith.]* Read, "That Gentiles, which were not following after righteousness, attained to righteousness, but the righteousness that is of faith." The two strange things are that "Gentiles" attained righteousness, and that they attained it without seeking it (Chrys.). Compare ii. 14: "Gentiles, that have not a law," to quicken the moral sense, are not, like Jews, consciously seeking to obtain righteousness: yet they "attained to righteousness, but the righteousness that is of faith." The "but" (δε iii. 22) introduces a special definition, an explanatory modification, by which the paradox is at once solved, so far as the Gentiles are concerned. See Winer, III. § lxxii. 7, b.

If here St. Paul "with the fewest words touches the deepest foundation of the matter" (Ewald), it is because he has already (iii., iv.) fully discussed the nature of that righteousness of faith in which the whole solution lies. Observe the thrice-repeated "righteousness," as in v. 31 the repetition of "law of righteousness." The whole passage is framed for pointed effect. "The hearer is strongly affected by the repetition of the same word, as if a weapon were to pierce the same part of the body again and again." Auctor ad Herenn. iv. 28. (Meyer.)

32 Wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law. For they stumbled at that stumblingstone;

33 As it is written, <sup>I</sup><sub>& 28. 16.</sub> Behold, I lay in Sion a stumblingstone and <sup>1 Pet. 2. 6.</sup> rock of offence: and whosoever believeth on him shall not be <sup>1 Or con-</sup>ashamed. <sub>founded.</sub>

*[But Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness.] "But Israel, following after a law of righteousness, did not attain unto a law [of righteousness]."*

What the Gentiles seek not, yet attain, is "righteousness," but what Israel seeks and yet fails to attain is not simply "righteousness," but "a law of righteousness," i.e., a law producing righteousness, such a rule of moral and religious life as could make them righteous before God. Such "a law of righteousness" they strove to find, and some did find, in God's law revealed by Moses (Luke i. 6): but the mass of the people "did not attain unto a law [of righteousness]." On the reading see the Additional Note.

32. *Wherefore?*] The question refers only to the case of Israel (v. 31): why did they not attain to a law of righteousness? With the received Text a Finite Verb (*έδιωξαν*), must be supplied in the answer: "Because they sought it not from faith, but as from works of law. For they stumbled," &c. The fact that they stumbled is thus regarded as a proof (from effect to cause) that they did not start from faith in God, but from a reliance on the merit of their own works. Had they started from faith, they would have found a law of righteousness, as the Apostle shows in the next chapter (x. 3-13).

But omitting *γίνηται* (with modern editors and Tisch. 8), we must supply a Participle *διώκοντες*, and render thus: "Because seeking it not from faith, but as from works, they stumbled," &c. The argument is thus direct and simple.

In "as of works," "as" indicates the idea which characterised their pursuit of a law of righteousness: they *thought* to attain to it from works. On this use of *ὡς* see Winer, III. § lxxv. 9, and compare 2 Cor. ii. 17.

*[They stumbled at that stumblingstone.] "They stumbled against the stone of stumbling."* The Articles indicate the well-known "stone of stumbling" of Isaiah viii. 14, where see notes.

33. *As it is written.]* Is. xxviii. 16. This is a remarkable example of the freedom with which St. Paul quotes the language of the O T.

Both passages as well as Ps. cxviii., were referred by the Jews to Messiah : see reff. in Rosenmüller on Is. viii. 14, and Schoettgen, 'Hore Heb.', and compare Matt. xxi. 42, Luke ii. 34, 1 Pet. ii. 6-8. St. Paul by taking the words "stone of stumbling and rock of offence" (Is. viii. 14), and substituting them in

Is. xxviii. 16, instead of "for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation," has combined both the threat and the promise in one quotation. The best comment is 1 Pet. ii. 6-8, where the different passages are all quoted separately : see the notes there.

### ADDITIONAL NOTES on vv. 5, 6, 8, 15, 17, 19, 31.

**5. A.** The reference of the words ὁ ὀν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός εὐλογότρος κ. τ. λ. to Christ is supported by the following considerations :—

(a) It is the natural and simple construction, which every Greek scholar would adopt without hesitation, if no question of doctrine were involved. This cannot be said for any other construction.

(b) It is suggested by the immediate context : thus Meyer, who rejects "the ancient ecclesiastical exposition," candidly confesses that "the contrast obviously implied in *rō kara σάρκα* would permit us mentally to supply a *rō kara πνεῦμα* as suggesting itself after ὁ ὀν. That self-evident negative antithesis—not as concerning the Spirit—would thus have in ὁ ὀν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός κ. τ. λ. its positive elucidation. Compare i. 3, and the note there on *kara σάρκα, kara πνεῦμα ἀγωνίνας*.

The true inference from the context is well expressed by Theodoret in Cramer's Catena : "And then last he puts the greatest of their blessings—"and of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh." And though the addition, "as concerning the flesh," was sufficient to imply (*παραδηλώσαι*) the deity of Christ, yet he adds, "who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen," both showing the difference of the natures, and explaining the reasonableness of his lamentation, that though He who is God over all was of them according to the flesh, yet they fell away from this kinship."

The assertion of Christ's Divine Majesty is thus admirably suited to the purpose of the passage, which is to extol the greatness of the privileges bestowed upon Israel, and so happily forfeited.

(c) The reference to Christ is supported by the unanimous consent of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. See Irenaeus, L. III. c. xvi. § 3; Tertullian, 'adv. Præxean,' c. xiii. c. xv.; Hippolytus, 'adv. Noetum,' vi.; Origen, in h. l.; Cyprian, 'Testimon.' II. 6; Novatian, 'de Trin.' c. xiii.; Methodius, 'Symeon et Anna,' § 1. In the Arian controversies our passage is constantly used by Athanasius : e.g. Or. I. c. Arianos, c. 10, 11, 24. The same interpretation is given by Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Augustine, Jerome, Cyril of Alexandria (c. Julian. x.), (Ecumenius, Theophylact).

Against this remarkable consent of Christian antiquity there is nothing to be set of any weight. Cyril puts into the mouth of the Emperor Julian a denial of the reference to Christ, only in order to affirm the true interpretation. Tischendorf brings forward two passages of Eusebius of Cæsarea, and two of the Pseudo-Ignatius ; but they do not refer to this passage, nor deny that Christ is "God over all" (*ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός*), but are directed against the Sabellian heresy which made Him identical with the Father, "*the God over all*" (*ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός*).

Even Socinus admits that the words are applied to Christ.

The chief objections urged against the ancient interpretation by modern theologians (Fritzsche, Baur, Ewald, Meyer, &c.) are as follows :

(1) That St. Paul never applies Θεός as a predicate to Christ.

(2) That to call Christ not simply Θεός, but, as here, ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός, is absolutely incompatible with the entire view of the N. T. as to the dependence of the Son on the Father.

(3) That in the genuine Apostolical writings we never meet with a doxology to Christ in the form which is usual with doxologies to God.

As to (1) see Notes on Tit. ii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 12; cf. 2 Pet. i. 1, iii. 18; Usteri, 'Paulin. Lehrbegriff.' p. 309, and Cremer, Lex. Θεός. Even if the fact were as asserted, it would not be conclusive against the application of Θεός to Christ in this passage. For what would be thought of an assertion that St. John could not have applied Θεός to Christ in Joh. i. 1, because (as is alleged by Meyer and others) he does not elsewhere so apply it? Compare the Additional Note on iii. 25, Obj. (5), for other examples of usages occurring once only in N. T.

(2) Bp. Lightfoot, in his profound discussion of the Christology of St. Paul ('Ep. to the Colossians,' p. 190), has shown that though St. Paul does not use the term Λόγος, his doctrine of the Person of Christ is in substance identical with that of St. John and the Epistle to the Hebrews, and is not adequately represented by "any conception short

of the perfect deity and perfect humanity of Christ."

We may add that "the dependence of the Son on the Father," as expressed in the N. T., (1 Cor. viii. 6, xv. 28) might be perfectly reconciled with the statement that He is "God over all," though not with the Sabellian view that He is "*the God over all*," i.e. the same Person as the Father.

But in fact the title "God over all" (earlier English versions) does not occur in this passage, nor apparently anywhere in the LXX or N. T. It is rightly corrected in the A.V. "*Who is over all, God blessed for ever.*" This follows the exact order of the Greek, agrees with St. Paul's usage in Eph iv. 6, and is the only construction which preserves the two-fold antithesis between Christ's Jewish origin and universal supremacy, and between His Human and Divine natures.

(3) In urging this third objection, Meyer does not deny that the doxologies in 2 Pet. iii. 18, Heb. xiii. 21, 2 Tim. iv. 18, refer to Christ, but regards this reference as "just one of the traces of post-apostolic composition." Nevertheless his objection is wide of the mark, for ὁ ὡν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός εὐλογητὸς κ. τ. λ. as applied to Christ is not a doxology at all; but a solemn declaration of Deity, exactly similar in form to 2 Cor. xi. 31; compare Rom. i. 25: it is remarkable that these two are the only passages, besides the present, in which the combination εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας is used by St. Paul, and in neither is it a Doxology, but an assertion respecting the subject of the sentence. (Alford.) The further objection, that εὐλογητὸς is never elsewhere applied to Christ, but only εὐλογημένος (Mat. xxi. 9; xxiii. 39, &c.), and that εὐλογητὸς, is only applied to God, and εὐλογημένος to man, is wholly fallacious. The LXX apply εὐλογητὸς to man in Deut. vii. 14; Ruth ii. 20; 1 Sam. xv. 13, and εὐλογημένος to God in 1 Chr. xvi. 36; 2 Chr. ix. 8; Ps. lxxii. 20; Ez. iii. 12, and in all these passages the Hebrew word is precisely the same.

## B.

Most of those who reject the ancient interpretation put a full-stop after σάρκα (with C and a few other MSS.), and take the whole clause as a doxology to the Father: "The God who is over all be blessed for ever."

(1) To this construction it is a fatal objection, that both in the LXX and in N. T., wherever εὐλογητὸς occurs in a doxology, it stands first, and that necessarily, on account of the emphasis: Ps. lxviii. 19, is no exception, nor are the other passages quoted by Fritzsche, 1 Kings x. 9; 2 Chr. ix. 8; Job i. 21; Ps. cxiii. 2, in all of which the Verb (*εἰνι, εἰστο*, γένεσθαι) stands first in the sentence, and εὐλογημένος, is used, not εὐλογητὸς.

(2) The participle ὁν is in this construction superfluous and awkward. Moreover ὁ ὡν must naturally be taken as an apposition to the preceding subject (ὁ Χριστός), there being nothing to indicate a departure from this most usual construction, of which see examples in 2 Cor. xi. 31; Joh. i. 18, and xii. 17.

(3) The enumeration of Israel's privileges, instead of rising to a climax, would come down at the close into a mere limitation and restriction—"as concerning the flesh."

(4) It has been shown in the foot-note that a doxology to the Father is not in harmony with the context.

In fact, the clause, taken as a doxology, is both in form and sense so tasteless and inappropriate, that we may confidently say, it was not so meant by St. Paul.

## C.

Erasmus, who is followed by Reuss, proposed to place the stop (as in Cod. 71) after πάντων, so that the preceding words refer to Christ, and then the doxology to God follows. But how intolerably abrupt is this! (Meyer.)

## D.

The conjectural transposition of ὁν ὁ for ὁ ὡν is perfectly arbitrary, and has nothing to recommend it. "Was St. Paul likely to affirm that the Jews had an exclusive interest in the One True God, when he had already in this very Epistle (iii. 29) asserted the contrary?" (Middleton.)

When we review the history of the interpretation, it cannot but be regarded as a remarkable fact that every objection urged against the ancient interpretation rests ultimately on dogmatic presuppositions, and that every alternative that has been proposed is more or less objectionable both in the form of expression and in the connection of thought.

We fully accept Dean Alford's conclusion, if only we may apply it to the A. V. instead of his rendering "God over all:" "The rendering given above is then not only that most agreeable to the usage of the Apostle, but the only one admissible by the rules of grammar and arrangement. It also admirably suits the context: for having enumerated the historic advantages of the Jewish people, he concludes by stating one which ranks far higher than all—that from them sprung, according to the flesh, He who is over all, God blessed for ever."

6. In this passage (οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ, οὐδεὶς Ἰσραὴλ) the sense is too clear to be mistaken even in the A. V. ("For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel"), but is much better expressed by the "Five Clergymen," "For not all they which are of Israel, are Israel." Here the emphasis

supplies in a measure the force of *οὗτοι*, which means "these as such" (vi *hujus termini*): it might be rendered here "are therefore Israel." (Peile.)

The demonstrative pronoun thus emphatically added repeats and enforces the preceding Subject, limits it emphatically to its previous definition, and makes it stand out in this limitation distinct and separate from all other notions. Compare Gal. iii. 7, *οἱ ἐκ πίστεως οὗτοι εἰσὶν υἱοὶ Ἀβραὰμ*. The effect is to affirm or deny the identity of the subject as *thus defined* with the predicate: see Bernhardy, 'Gk. Syntax,' 283; Winer, Part III. § 23, 24; Plato, 'Charmides,' p. 163, C.

In *οὐ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκός, ταῦτα τέκνα Θεοῦ*, etc., this force of the pronoun has not been rightly expressed in the A. V.: "*They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God.*" According to this rendering all the children of the flesh seem to be excluded, and the passage has in fact been frequently thus misunderstood; e.g. "As Ishmael, who was born after the flesh (Gal. iv. 23), i.e. according to the course of nature, was rejected, so also are the children of the flesh" (Hodge). To justify this interpretation, *τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκός* must be taken in a pregnant sense, "the children of the flesh who are nothing more than children of the flesh." In Gal. iv. 22, 23, 29, this sense is made clear by the distinction made from the first between the one son "born after the flesh" and the other "by promise." Here the Apostle expresses the same truth in a different way, by drawing a distinction between "all that are of Israel," and "Israel" in the true sense of the name,—between the seed of Abraham as a whole, and the promised seed. This form of expression is best suited to the Apostle's purpose of showing how God maintained the principle of election in every stage of the patriarchal and national history.

The right explanation is given by the Greek Fathers generally, and is well expressed by Eusebius: *οὐ γὰρ ἐπειδὴ τινες τέκνα σαρκικά τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, ἥδη καὶ τέκνα εἰσὶ καὶ ἐπαγγελίαν.*

15. The A. V. by repeating the same tense, "*I will have mercy*," represents correctly the *sense* both of the Hebrew and of the Greek, in which the tenses, though differing in form, are strictly co-ordinate in sense. Meyer's remark "that the Future denotes the actual compassion fulfilling itself in point of fact, which God promises to show to the persons concerned, towards whom He stands in the mental relation (*ἐλεώ*, Present) of pity," is grammatically incorrect (Donaldson, 'Greek Gr.' §§ 505, 514; Madvig, §§ 121, 125; Winer, part iii. sect. xli. p. 306, &c. &c.).

Some think that the emphasis lies on the repeated verb: "My mercy shall be (pure)

mercy" (Alford), or, "My mercy shall be sure and great" (Dean Jackson, ix. 440).

But the real emphasis is on the Relative ("whomsoever"), as is apparent in the Greek, where the force of *τι* is thrown on it (Jelf, 'Gr. Gr.' § 428; Madvig, § 126). Thus the sense is, "the objects of God's mercy are chosen by that mercy itself, and not by anything external to it." This sense is explained in v. 16, and expressly asserted in v. 18, "*Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will.*"

17. It is important to compare the versions of the passage quoted, Ex. ix. 16, with the original.

Heb. (literally rendered). "But indeed because of this I made thee stand, because of making thee see my power, and to the intent that my name may be declared in all the earth."

LXX: *καὶ ἐνεκεν τούτου διετηρήθης, ἵνα ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν δύναμιν μου, καὶ ὅπως διαγγελῇ τὸ ὄντομά μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ.*

St. Paul: *εἰς αὐτὸν τούτον ἐξήγειρα σε, ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν δύναμιν μου, κ.τ.λ.*

A. V. (Rom. ix. 17) "Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth."

(a.) The A. V. Ex. ix. 16, "*And in very deed for this cause*," and St. Paul's *εἰς αὐτὸν τούτον* are more emphatic and precise, and in this agree better with the Heb., than does *ἐνεκεν τούτου* (LXX).

(b.) The margin, "*I have made thee stand*," correctly represents *נָשַׁרְתָּה*, Hiphil of *שָׁרַע*, which Fürst renders, "statuere, stabilire; præficere, constituere; conservare, confirmare."

Gesenius wrongly ascribes to it the meaning "rouse, stir up," in Neh. vi. 7 (A. V. "appoint"), and in Dan. xi. 11, 13, where it means "set in array," "constituere aciem."

The meaning "establish, uphold, preserve" is found in 1 Ki. xv. 4, 2 Chr. ix. 8, Prov. xxix. 4, and Dan. xi. 14.

It thus appears that *διετηρήθης* "thou wast preserved" (LXX) is right in sense, but wrong in substituting the Passive for the Active Voice: as the Active expresses God's agency more directly and emphatically, and so is better suited to St. Paul's purpose of declaring His absolute power, he restores it in *ἐξήγειρα σε*, "I have raised thee up" as from danger or death. The Compound Verb in the only passage where it is found in the N. T., 1 Cor. vi. 14, and in Job v. 11, *ἀπολωλότας ἐξεγείροντα εἰς σωτηρίαν* has this signification.

This sense, "I have raised up," or "preserved thee," is supported by the LXX *διετηρήθης*, by a various reading in the Hexapla *διετηρήσα σε*, by Orig. Philocalia c. xxxii. *διετηρήθη Φαραὼ ὑπὲρ ἐνδείξεως δυνάμεως Θεοῦ*

by Chrys. in l. *eis autò τοῦτο ἐπρέπει*, by Onkelos, and the Arabic in Walton's Polyglott (see below), and is admitted by Meyer to be the correct historical interpretation of Ex. ix. 16. Many other meanings have been invented:

(1.) I have brought thee into existence (Beza).

(2.) I have brought thee forward and laid this part upon thee (Calvin).

(3.) I have raised thee to the throne (Glöckler).

(4.) I have stirred thee up to resistance (Augustine).

"But" (to use Meyer's words) "these special definitions of the sense make the Apostle say something so entirely different, both from the original and from the LXX, that they ought to be necessitated by the context; but this is not the case."

The same criticism condemns Meyer's own artificial interpretation that *Paul expands* the special sense of the Hebrew word (*i. e.* "preserved"), to denote the whole appearance of Pharaoh: "I have caused thee to emerge," thy whole historical appearance has been brought about by me, in order that, &c.

(c.) Instead of "show my power in thee," the Hebrew means "show to thee," lit. "make thee to see my power." The A. V. recognises this true rendering in Ex. ix. 16, by printing "*in*" in Italics: so all the ancient versions, as represented in Walton's Polyglott;

*Onkelos*: "Sustinui te, ut ostenderem *tibi*;" &c.

*Samar*: "Subsistere te feci, ut ostenderem *tibi*."

*Arab.* "Te reservavi, ut ostenderem *tibi*."

*Syr.* "Ob id te constitui, ut ostenderem *tibi*."

From these remarks, and the notes in this commentary on Ex. ix. 15 and 16, it will be seen that the sense of the whole passage is as follows: "I will spare thee no longer, but smite thee to the heart with all my plagues, that thou mayest know that there is no power like mine (*v. 14*): for if I had not withheld my hand, but had stretched it out to smite thee and thy people with the pestilence, thou wouldest have been cut off from the earth at once. But indeed I spared and upheld thee, for this very purpose (already declared in *v. 14*) to show thee my power."

As Pharaoh is solemnly warned in *v. 14* that he will be smitten to the heart, in being taught that there is none like God, it is clear that the words "show thee my power" in *v. 16*, also include the contingency of Pharaoh's continued resistance and destruction, and are used in the same rhetorical sense as we find in Ex. xiv. 4, 18. "And the Egyptians shall know that I am the Lord." Compare Judges viii. 16, 1 Sam. xiv. 12: "we will show you a thing," "we will make you to know." A still

more striking example of this mode of expression is found in Ps. lxx. 13: "Consume them in wrath, consume them, that they may not be; and let them know that God ruleth in Jacob unto the ends of the earth." The persons indicated are the same throughout, and the Psalmist's meaning is, Let them perish, and in perishing learn God's power. See Delitzsch on the Psalm.

We thus see that the rendering of the LXX, though grammatically wrong, is not bad in sense: for as Pharaoh did in fact perish in being taught the greatness of God's power, it seemed to the LXX more natural to regard the lesson as *tought to others in his person*: and this interpretation being equally suitable to St. Paul's argument, is adopted by him, but not without a very significant change.

(d.) For *ἴνα ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοί* (LXX) St. Paul writes *ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ . . . καὶ ὅπως διαγγελή τὸ ὄνομα μου*, κ. τ. λ. The reason is evident. According to the Hebrew God's first and direct purpose in upholding Pharaoh was "to show him His power;" the secondary purpose, contingent on the fulfilment of the former, was "that God's name might be declared in all the earth." The LXX version, "show in thee my power," reduces the primary purpose to a mere equivalent of the secondary, and therefore St. Paul rejects *ἴνα* and uses *ὅπως* in both clauses: "for this very purpose I upheld thee, that so," &c. This repetition of *ὅπως* is found nowhere else in N. T.

*Hofm.* "St. Paul renders בְּעִירָה as well as בְּעַמָּה by *ὅπως*, to express what God wished *in this way* to attain."

*Van Hengel*, admitting fully that *ὅπως* and *ἴνα* are often used indifferently, in other writers as well as in the LXX and N. T., yet maintains (and proves) that in many passages both of the Classical and Biblical writers there is an unquestionable distinction. Besides Plat. Rep. viii. 566 E, 567 A, and Xen. Mem. IV. iv. 16, cited by Van H., see also Mem. II. i. 19, Anab. II. vi. 21, and Kühner's note.

In St. Paul's epistles we may notice 1 Cor. i. 27, where the design embraces two actions one immediate (*ἴνα τὰ ὄντα καταργήσῃ*), the other contingent on it (*ὅπως μὴ κακχησται πάσα στρέψῃ*, "that so no flesh," &c.).

2. Cor. viii. 13, 14: *ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ τὸ ἴμων περισσευμα εἰς τὸ ἔκεινων ὑστέρημα ίνα καὶ τὸ ἔκεινων περισσευμα εἰς τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα, ὅπως γένηται λούσης.* 2 Thess. i. 12 (similar).

19. St. Paul seems to have in mind such passages as Wisdom xii. 12: *τίς γὰρ ἐρεῖ, τί ἐποίησες; ή τίς ἀντιστήσεται τῷ κριματί σου;* Job ix. 19: *τίς οὐν κριματί ἀντοῦ ἀντιστησεται;* Two cautions are needed.

1. St. Paul speaks here, not of the primary and spontaneous will of God, not of that

which God, of Himself alone, desires ( $\theta\deltaημα$ ); but of the counsel or decree which He so forms as to include and overrule the free action of man ( $\betaούλημα$ ). See Eph. i. 5, 11: Donaldson's 'New Cratylus,' § 463; Plato, 'Leges' vi. 769 D, vii. 802, c.

When  $\epsilon\thetaλω$  and  $\betaούλωμα$  are distinguished, the former means the simple spontaneous will, the latter the conscious and deliberate purpose. See Ammonius, ed. Valckn. pp. 31, 70, whose remark has been too hastily rejected.

2. It is again the *event*, and not the intermediate *process*, that is in question. Man does resist the will of God ( $\theta\deltaημα$ ), that primary will, which leads him to repentance, but the event always corresponds with the Divine purpose ( $\betaούλημα$ ).

31. The second  $\deltaικαιοσύνης$  has considerable authority, especially of Versions and Fathers, but is not found in the earliest Uncials, and is rejected by nearly all critical editors. Many good interpreters, however, still consider it indispensable in the text; Meyer calls it "the tragic point of the negative counter-statement."

The point of the paradox certainly is that the Jews failed to attain the very thing which they were following after, i.e., "a law of righteousness." If therefore  $\deltaικαιοσύνης$  be not repeated, still  $\nuόμον$  must have the same meaning as in the first clause, "a law" such as they were seeking, and therefore, in fact, "a law of righteousness."

## CHAPTER X.

5 *The scripture sheweth the difference betwixt the righteousness of the law, and this of faith, 11 and that all, both Jew and Gentile, that believe, shall not be confounded, 18 and that the Gentiles shall receive the word and believe. 19 Israel was not ignorant of these things.*

### CHAP. X.—THE CAUSE OF ISRAEL'S STUMBLING.

The subject of this chapter is the fact asserted in ix. 31–33, that Israel failed to attain a law of righteousness because they sought a righteousness dependent on the merit of their own works. But before entering on the painful and invidious task of condemning his own nation, St. Paul renews the assurance of his heartfelt interest in their salvation.

1. *Brethren,*] This expression of affection towards his readers is the more appropriate here because there were many Jewish Christians among them.

*my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved.]* "My heart's desire and my supplication to God on their behalf is for salvation." The word ( $\epsilon\upsilonδοκία$ ) here rendered "desire," and in Phil. i. 15 "good will," ii. 13 "good pleasure," means not mere passive benevolence, but an active delight and pleasure, which "when directed to an object not actually existent, but still to be realised, has of course the character of a wish" (Philippi). Compare 2 Cor. v. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 8, and Bp. Lightfoot's notes on Philippians.

For the distinction between "prayer" ( $\piροσευχή$ ) in general, but addressed to God only, and  $\deltaέστις$ , a petition for some particular benefit addressed to God or man, see Phil.

BRETHREN, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved.

2 For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge.

3 For they being ignorant of

iv. 6, Eph. vi. 18, 1 Tim. ii. 1, v. 5, in all of which passages the A. V. has "supplication."

"*For Israel*" is a reading probably due to the commencement of a new chapter in Church Lectionaries: the true reading ( $aὐτῶν$ ) shows the close connection with ch. ix.

In  $\eta\mu\varepsilonν\epsilon\upsilonδοκία$  the limiting particle shows that there is already in the Apostle's mind a thought opposed to that which he would desire: this thought is found in v. 3.

Van Hengel imagines a different antithesis, "the goodwill of my heart on their behalf, whatever their own perverse will may be." But the slightly emphatic  $\epsilon\upsilonδίς$  is due to the distinction between the desire of St. Paul's own heart and his supplication to God.

2. *For I bear them record]* The reason of the Apostle's desire and prayer for Israel: he knew their zeal and their want of knowledge, for he had shared largely in both (Acts xxii. 3).

"*Zeal for God,*" being in itself good, is an encouragement to prayer on their behalf. St. Paul's affection is thus again seen in pointing first to that which is praiseworthy: see on i. 8.

*but not according to knowledge.]*  $\epsilon\pi\gammaγωνίς$  is full and thorough knowledge, not that imperfect knowledge ( $\gammaνώσις$ ) which "puffeth up" (1 Cor. viii. 1, xiii. 12: compare Rom. i. 28; Eph. i. 17). That the zeal of the Jews

God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God.

was without the guidance of this true knowledge, is shown in the next verse.

**3. For they being ignorant of God's righteousness,**] “**For being ignorant**,” &c.; “**they**,” being wholly without emphasis, should have a less prominent place in the sentence.

They were ignorant that the only source of righteousness is God, “**who justifieth the ungodly**” (iii. 21-26; iv. 5); and thus “**zeal for God**” only made them seek to set up and “**establish**” (iii. 31) *their own righteousness*, i. e. the righteousness which they thought they could make valid before God by strict observance of His law (Phil. iii. 9).

*have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God.*] “**The righteousness of God**” is here presented as His divine ordinance for man's salvation, and in its very essence, as God's righteousness, it involves man's self-renunciation and submission.

For the Middle sense of *ὑπέταγματα* compare viii. 7, xiii. 1; Heb. xii. 9; James iv. 7; 1 Pet. ii. 13. Read “**For being ignorant of God's righteousness, and seeking to establish their own righteousness, they submitted not unto the righteousness of God.**”

**4. For Christ is the end of the law]** Confirmation of v. 3. The Jews sought to establish their own righteousness by the Law; but this was a fatal error, causing them to reject the righteousness of God: *for the Law, regarded as a way of attaining to righteousness before God, is at an end in Christ, and gives place to the righteousness of faith.*

Christ is the end of the Law, as “death is the end of life” (*τελος τοῦ βίου θάνατος*: Demosth. 1306, 25).

This most common and simple meaning of *τέλος* is required by the emphatic contrast between law and faith in the beginning and end of the sentence, and also by the whole context, which describes the righteousness of faith as opposed to the righteousness that is of the law, not as the completion, nor as the aim of the law.

In this passage it is *not grammatically wrong* to render *τέλον*, without the article, “the Law;” see Introduction, § 9. But it is better to interpret it as “**law**” in general, the principle which says “*This do, and thou shalt live.*” In this sense, “**law**” is abolished in Christ, and the purpose of its abolition is expressed in the words “*for righteousness to every one that believeth.*”

For other interpretations, see Note at the end of the Chapter.

**4 For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.**

**5 For Moses describeth the right-**

*for righteousness to every one that believeth.*] This is the purpose of the abolition of “**law**” in Christ. If “**law**” remained in force as the condition of righteousness, then righteousness could not be extended “*to every one that believeth*,” but only to those who were under law and only if they were “*doers of law*” (ii. 13).

#### 5-10. MOSES BEARS WITNESS TO THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF FAITH.

**5. the righteousness which is of the law,**] Read, *the righteousness which is of law*, and for the various readings of v. 5 see the note at the end of the chapter.

*the man which doeth those things]* “*The man which doeth them.*”

In Lev. xviii. 5 God says, “*Ye shall therefore keep my statutes, and my judgments: which if a man do, he shall live in them.*”

The Septuagint, from which St. Paul quotes the passage exactly, reads in the former part of the verse “*Ye shall therefore keep all my statutes and all my judgments.*” Thus in the keeping of all “*statutes*” and “*judgments*” the Apostle sees a description of “*the righteousness which is of law*,” and in the clause “*which if a man do*” he finds a condition which cannot be perfectly fulfilled by fallen man, and which therefore condemns one who depends on his own fulfilment of the law for justification before God.

That this is St. Paul's meaning is clear from the context in vv. 3, 4, and from the whole tenor of this Epistle (ii. 13, iii. 20, &c.), as well as from the earlier quotation of the same passage in Gal. iii. 12, where the meaning is put beyond doubt by another quotation, “*Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them*” (Deut. xxvii. 26).

But in assuming that the condition, “*if a man do them,*” is impracticable, St. Paul seems exactly to reverse the natural meaning of the words of Moses. Either those words really mean that God's law given to Israel consisted of statutes and judgments which *might be kept* and by keeping which they should enter into life: or else they are nothing better than an ironical promise based upon an impossible condition. The latter thought cannot be for a moment entertained: for it is God Himself who speaks through Moses, repeating the commandment and the promise twice, and confirming them by the most solemn formula of Divine attestation, “*I am*

<sup>“Lev. 18.</sup> eousness which is of the law, ”That <sup>5. Ezek.</sup> the man which doeth those things <sup>20. 11.</sup> Gal. 3. 12. shall live by them.

6 But the righteousness which is <sup>“Deut. 30.</sup> of faith speaketh on this wise, ”Say <sup>12.</sup> not in thine heart, Who shall ascend

into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down *from above*.)

7 Or, Who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead.)

8 But what saith it? <sup>“Deut. 30.</sup> The word <sup>14.</sup>

*the LORD.*” The references to the passage by Ezekiel (xx. 11, 13, 21) and Nehemiah (ix. 13, 29) clearly show that in their view the condition was not impracticable nor the promise unattainable.

Did then St. Paul misrepresent or misunderstand the passage? Not St. Paul himself, but those unbelieving Jews, whose error he was exposing.

To one who sincerely desired “*to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with his God*” (Mic. vi. 8), “the law,” taken in its fulness and in its spirit, was undoubtedly a path of righteousness and life. It was a revelation of God Himself and of His holy will, accompanied by a dispensation full of the means of grace, of pardon, and reconciliation for every humble and contrite soul, full also of types and promises leading on to Christ.

But the Pharisees, and under their guidance the mass of the people, did not thus regard “*the Law*:” to them it was “*law*” and nothing more, a covenant of works as opposed to a covenant of grace, its promise of life depending on the merit of strict and scrupulous obedience. Such a view has only to be pushed to its legitimate conclusion in order to confute itself: and this is what St. Paul does: “If you would attain to righteousness by *the law* merely as ‘*law*’, then it must be fulfilled to the very letter. Keep all the statutes, and *all* the judgments fully and perfectly, and then you shall ‘find life in them.’”

St. Paul’s method is in fact the same as our Lord’s: his answer to those who are seeking “*the righteousness which is of law*” is “This do, and thou shalt live” (Luke x. 28). He reminds them, as it were, that “*whosoever shall keep the whole law and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all*” (Ja. ii. 10): he uses the words of the Law as they were used by those who rejected “*the righteousness which is of faith*:” he means, as in Gal. iii. 21, that there is no law which simply as *law* can give life, and therefore no such thing as a “*righteousness which is of law*.”

6. But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise,] For a similar personification and self-description of Wisdom, see Prov. i. 20, and Heb. xii. 5. Apart from the figure, the meaning is that Moses thus speaks concerning “*the righteousness which is of faith*. ”

Thus both parts of v. 4 are proved by the testimony of Moses—the impossibility of being justified by law in v. 5, and the reality and nearness of the righteousness of faith in vv. 6–8.

But where does St. Paul find “the righteousness of faith” in the words of Moses? In Deuteronomy, “the book of Moses, which has been regarded almost as an evangelization of the law” (Jowett). Observe also that in Deut. xxx. 11–14, Moses speaks to those to whom he has previously said in v. 6, “*God will circumcise thine heart, . . . to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live*:” that is to say, Moses is speaking to the truly penitent and faithful Israelites. And as St. Paul found “*the righteousness of faith*” in Abraham, who believed God, so here he finds its very essence in one who loves God, and turns to Him with all his heart and soul (Deut. xxx. 6–10).

*Say not in thine heart.*] This is found in Deut. viii. 17, and ix. 4, and is substituted by St. Paul for the one word, “*to say*,” in Deut. xxx. 12: “*It is not in heaven, that thou shouldest say [lit. ‘to say’], Who shall go up for us to heaven, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it?*”

“To say in the heart” is a Hebrew idiom meaning “to think,” especially to think perverse unholy thoughts, which one is ashamed to speak out (Philippi): compare Deut. xv. 9, xviii. 21; Ps. xiv. 1; Matt. xxiv. 48; Rev. xviii. 7.

Moses thus vindicates God’s commandment as not being beyond man’s reach, but already brought near and made plain to him: in Baruch iii. 29, similar language is applied to wisdom.

*that is, to bring Christ down.*] As Moses forbids the Israelite to say, We want some one to bring God’s word down nearer to us, so “*the righteousness of faith*” says to us, “Doubt not that Christ has already come down.”

The words, “*from above*,” are a needless addition in the A. V.: the parenthesis, too, is unnecessary, the citations and comments being clearly distinguished without it.

7. *Or, Who shall descend into the deep?*] Deut. xxx. 13: “*Neither is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldest say, Who shall go over the sea for us,*” &c. This is a second figure by

is nigh thee, *even* in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith, which we preach;

9 That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath

raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.

10 For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.

which Moses declares that God's commandment is not inaccessible; but St. Paul, in applying the passage to Christ, brought still nearer to us by the resurrection, changes the idea of crossing the sea into that of going down into "the abyss;" and by "the abyss" he means not the deep of the sea, but the abode of the dead, "the depths of the earth," Ps. lxxi. 20: ἐκ τῶν ἀβύσσων τῆς γῆς πάλιν ἀνήγαγε με, a passage which seems to have been in St. Paul's mind, and to have suggested the words ἀβύσσος and πάλιν ἀνήγαγεν.

8. But what saith it?] As if the negative in v. 6 had been joined with λέγει: "the righteousness which is of faith saith not, Who shall ascend, &c.? But what saith it?"

*The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart.]* "And yet what need is there either of long journeys over the land, or of long voyages, for the sake of investigating and seeking out virtue, the roots of which the Creator has laid not at any great distance, but so near, as the wise Lawgiver of the Jews says, 'They are in thy mouth, and in thy heart, and in thy hands,' intimating by these figurative expressions the words, and actions, and designs of men" (Philo, 'The Virtuous is Free,' c. x.).

St. Paul omits the words "and in thy hands" added to the original by the LXX, and the concluding words of Deut. xxx. 14, "that thou mayest do it," which are less suited to his argument. "The Apostle quotes without regard to verbal exactness, apparently because he is dwelling rather on the truth that he is expounding, than on the words in which it is conveyed, not verifying references by a book, but speaking from the fulness of the heart" (Jowett).

*That is, the word of faith, which we preach.]* The word that is very nigh, in the mouth and in the heart, is essentially the same as "the word which speaks of faith," i.e. the gospel which announces "faith" as the principle of righteousness.

"Faith" is not here used in its objective sense (*τῆς πίστεως*) (Gal. i. 23), "the faith," i.e. the Christian faith; but the article is required by the mention of "faith" in the context, and cannot be translated.

9. *That if thou shalt confess.]* The contents of "the word of faith which we preach" are here shown to correspond with the teaching of Deuteronomy. The rendering, "for if

thou shalt believe," makes this *proof* of correspondence more formal, but is not necessary.

The correspondence itself lies in the consent of heart and mouth required both by Moses and by the preachers of "*the word of faith*"

*the Lord Jesus.]* "That Jesus is Lord": the Vatican MS. gives the same sense in a different form, derived probably from the parallel passages, 1 Cor. xii. 3; Phil. ii. 11. "In this appellation [Jesus the Lord] lies the sum of faith and salvation" (Bengel). The reference to v. 6, "*Who shall ascend into heaven? that is, to bring Christ down,*" shows that Jesus is here called Lord, not simply as the exalted Head of the Church (compare Eph. iv. 9-11), but as the only-begotten Son of God, "*the Lord from heaven*" (1 Cor. xv. 47).

*that God hath raised him from the dead.]* This answers to v. 7. The Deity of Christ, and His resurrection, are the chief objects of justifying faith (i. 4; iv. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 17, &c.).

10. The mention in Deut. of "mouth" and "heart" having been interpreted by St. Paul of confession and faith, he now shows that this interpretation is in accordance with the general principles of the Christian dispensation, in which belief of the heart and confession by the mouth are both required. "Heart" and "mouth," the emphatic words in each sentence, are now placed in their natural order.

Justification and salvation are here distinguished as in v. 9, where see note. Salvation presupposes a continuance of the faith which justifies, and a consequent realisation of the effects of faith, of which confession is one: see Barrow on the Creed, Sermon V. towards the end.

Looking back upon the whole passage (vv. 5-10) we may ask, Does St. Paul regard the words of Moses as a *prediction* of the nature of the righteousness of faith to be subsequently revealed? (Fritzsche, p. 389.) Or does he mean that besides the plain grammatical and historical sense of the words of Moses, there is also an *indirect allegorical and typical sense* which foreshadows the subsequent revelation of the righteousness of faith? (Meyer.) Or does the Apostle merely make a free use of the words of Moses to clothe his own thoughts? Is there

<sup>¶</sup> Is. 28.  
<sup>16</sup>

11 For the scripture saith, <sup>¶</sup>Who-soever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.

12 For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for

nothing more than a graceful allusion (Bengel), "a holy and beautiful play of God's Spirit upon the word of the Lord?" (Philippi, Van Hengel.)

Better than any of these explanations is the view held by Augustine that the words of Moses, understood in their true spiritual sense, describe a righteousness which is essentially the righteousness of faith ('de Nat. et Gratia,' § 83).

Moses is in fact describing a religion of the heart: "*The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live*" (v. 6). To one who thus turns with heart and soul to the Lord obedience is easy; "*the word is very nigh thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart.*" This, says St. Paul, is in substance "*the word of faith, which we preach.*"

St. Paul's explanation is not allegorical but spiritual: "it penetrates through the letter of the O. T. to its spirit" (Olshausen), and that is the spirit of the Gospel.

### 11-13. THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF FAITH IS FOR ALL.

11. On the quotation from Isaiah xxviii. 16, see above ix. 33: by repeating it here St. Paul both confirms the preceding description of "*the righteousness which is of faith,*" and passes on to the further thought that this righteousness is free for all. The statement in Isaiah is unlimited, "*he that believeth;*"; and St. Paul by the addition of one word (*πᾶς*) makes it expressly universal, "*every one that believeth,*" and also definite "*believeth on him,*" i. e. on Christ.

12. The universality thus emphatically given to the statement of Isaiah is now justified on the ground that the condition, "*be that believeth;*" makes no distinction between Jew and Greek (compare iii. 22); and the cause of this unlimited bestowal of blessing is traced to the bounty of its Divine Author. The promise in Isaiah of the "precious corner stone" is Messianic, and therefore really universal, God's mercy in Christ embracing all the nations of the earth.

*for the same Lord over all is rich, &c.* Rather, "*For the same is Lord of all, being rich unto all that call upon him.*" That Christ, not God the Father, is here called "*Lord of all,*" is clear from v. 9, as

the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him.

13 <sup>¶</sup>For whosoever shall call upon <sup>¶</sup>Joel 2.  
<sup>32.</sup> the name of the Lord shall be <sup>¶</sup>Acts 2. 21.  
saved.

well as from such passages as ch. xiv. 9, Phil. ii. 11, Acts x. 36.

The universality of justification by faith, which is proved in ch. iii. 30, from the truth that "*it is one God,*" the God both of Jews and Gentiles, who shall justify both, is here in like manner shown from the fact that there is one and the same "**Lord of all,**" who is rich unto all "in grace and salvation which no multitude can exhaust" (Bengel): compare 1 Tim. ii. 5.

*all that call upon him.*] In like manner St. Paul designates Christians in 1 Cor. i. 2 as "*all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours*" compare 2 Tim. ii. 22.

"That calling on God, whereon salvation depends, is not in words only, but in heart and deed. For what the heart believeth, the mouth confesseth, the hand in deed fulfillleth" (Hugo de S. Vict. quoted by Pusey on Joel, ii. 32).

13. To "*call upon the Lord*" means to worship Him, and therefore, among other things included in true worship, to confess Him with the mouth, as in vv. 9, 10, and the expression thus prepares the way for the Scriptural proof of the statement that "*with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.*" This proof is quoted exactly in the words of the LXX from the great prophecy of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in Joel ii. 32, "*Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered (saved).*" The words "*all flesh*" (Joel ii. 28) show that Gentiles are included in the prophecy. See note on the passage.

This is one of the strongest passages in favour of addressing prayer to Christ. It is admitted that to "*call upon the name of the Lord*" means in the original passage to pray to Jehovah as God.

It is also admitted that the "*Lord of all*" in v. 12 is Christ: and that St. Paul refers the word "*Lord,*" which in the original points to *God*, justly to *Christ*, whose name is now the very specific object of the *Christian* calling on the Lord.

With these admissions there is little real significance left in Meyer's fine-drawn distinction between "*worshipping absolutely,*" as it takes place only in respect of the Father as the One absolute *God*, and "*worship* according to that relativity in the consciousness of the worshipper, which is conditioned by the

**14** How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?

relation of Christ to *the Father*, whose Son of like nature, whose image, partner of the Throne, Mediator and Advocate on the part of men, He is."

**14—21. THE GOSPEL PREACHED TO ALL REJECTED BY ISRAEL.**

This passage brings another proof that the fault of Israel's exclusion lies in themselves. From the nature of the salvation just described, it follows that the Gospel must be preached to all without distinction. But this very freedom of *the offer of salvation to every believer*, was a stumbling-block to the unbelieving Jews, as the Apostle's experience had often proved (Acts xiii. 45—47, xviii. 6, xxviii. 28). St. Paul, as usual, closely connects this new topic with the preceding context: commenting, as it were, upon the words of Joel, "**E**very one whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord," he argues first that "*the name of the Lord*" to be invoked must be believed, and thereto must be heard, and thereto proclaimed, and thereto preachers must be sent, according to Isaiah iii. 7 (vv. 14, 15).

The Gospel being thus preached, if "*not all*," to wit, not Israel, have obeyed it (v. 16), they have neither the excuse of not having heard (v. 18), nor of not having known that the invitation was to be preached to all nations, but the fault lies in their own perversity (vv. 19—21).

**14. How then]** Each question in the chain is an argument, the conclusion of which is tacitly assumed, and forms the ground of the next question, e.g. "How can they call upon the Lord unless they believe on Him? They cannot: therefore they must first believe. How can they believe, if they have not heard? they cannot;" and so on.

*of whom they have not heard.*] Rather, "**Whom they have not heard:**" in Ephes. iv. 21, on the contrary, we ought to read, "*if ye have heard of Him.*" Here, as in Eph. ii. 17, the Lord is heard speaking through His messengers, as is shown in the next question.

**15. except they be sent?**] By whom? By the same Lord (v. 13) whose name they proclaim.

In N. T. the Father "*sends*" the Son, and the Son "*sends*" His Apostles: their mission includes all ministry derived from them.

**15** And how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, "How beautiful are the feet of them" <sup>Is. 52. 7.  
Nah. 1. 15.</sup> that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!

**16** But they have not all obeyed

Compare Luke ix. 2, x. 1, 3; John iv. 38, xvii. 18; Acts xxvi. 17; 1 Cor. i. 17.

St. Paul argues back from effect to cause, through the series of Prayer, Faith, Hearing, Preaching, Sending: thus the last link in his argument must be the first in the realisation, from which the rest follow: this one, therefore, he confirms by the prophetic announcement in Isa. lii. 7, of the going forth of the Gospel messengers: "*How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation.*" The prophecy rings with a joy like that which the Apostle himself felt in contemplating the spread of the Gospel throughout the world.

St. Paul quotes the passage freely and briefly, omitting what belongs simply to the poetic colouring—"upon the mountains," turns the collective singular, "*him that bringeth good tidings,*" into the plural, and omits the words "*that publisheth salvation.*"

*that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good!*] Rather, *That bring glad tidings of peace, that bring glad tidings of good.* The repetition of the same word in the Hebrew, and in the Greek, ought to be preserved in the English translation. See the note at the end of the chapter, and the notes on Isaiah, and compare Nahum i. 15.

In the foreshortened perspective of prophecy the return from the captivity in Babylon, to which the passage of Isaiah primarily refers, seems to be coincident with the coming of Messiah, which it symbolises and prepares. The progress of time had shown St. Paul the distinction between the partial or typical and the complete fulfilment which he here rightly affirms.

"*How beautiful are the feet*" means simply, "*how welcome is the coming.*"

**16. But they have not all obeyed the Gospel]** Rather, "**But they did not all obey the glad tidings.**"

The messengers were sent, "Isaiah in spirit saw their glad steps" (Bengel); God's part was done: *But*, notwithstanding this, they did not all hearken to and obey (2 Thess. i. 8) the Gospel message.

The message was addressed to all, but the Jews as a nation (for St. Paul is here speaking of them nationally, not individually) did not

<sup>1</sup>Is. 53. 1.  
<sup>1</sup>John 12. 38.  
<sup>1</sup>Gr. <sup>1</sup>hearing  
of us.  
<sup>1</sup>Or,  
preaching.

the gospel. For Esaias saith, 'Lord, who hath believed <sup>1</sup>our report?

17 So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.

18 But I say, Have they not heard? Yes verily, <sup>1</sup>their sound <sup>1</sup>Ps. 12. 4.

went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world.

submit to the requirement of faith and calling upon the Lord. Some commentators suppose the statement "they did not all obey" to refer to the Gentiles, but this is contrary to the tenor of the whole context: St. Paul is dealing in this chapter with the unbelief of the Jews, not of the Gentiles, and the words which he cites from Isaiah, refer in their primary sense to Israel, as distinguished from Gentiles, and are expressly applied to the Jews by St. John, xii. 38: see the notes on Isai. liii. 1.

*For Esaias saith,*] The disobedience of the Jews was an event foreseen in God's counsel: it was so to be, for Isaiah foretells it: compare John xii. 38, "Yet they believed not on Him: that the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, Lord, who bath believed our report?"

"Our report," literally, "the hearing of us" (Margin), i.e. the message heard from us. The Prophet is lamenting not merely the disbelief of his own age, but, in close connection with the passage above quoted (in which he foresees the coming of Him "that publisheth salvation, that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth") he goes on to speak in the close of ch. liii. of the servant of God, who shall first be abased and then exalted; and then in ch. liii. 1, he sees and mourns over the disbelief of his own message, and the consequent rejection of Messiah. The word "Lord," added here and in the Greek versions of Isai. liii. 1, shows the prophet turning to Jehovah, as the sender of the message, to complain of the incredulity with which it is received. The addition is in harmony with the original meaning of the passage, and with St. Paul's comment upon it in v. 17.

"Who bath believed?" Instead of saying, with literal accuracy, "How few?" the Prophet, followed by the Apostle, overlooks the few faithful ones in his passionate grief over the mass of unbelievers.

17. *by hearing*] Rather, "*from hearing*."

Again, as in v. 14, St. Paul comments on the words quoted, and from the question, "Who hath believed the message heard from us?" draws a confirmation of his argument in vv. 14, 15, for the necessary dependence of faith upon the hearing and preaching of the Gospel. He thus brings out more clearly the ground of the objection which follows in v. 18.

"Hearing" must mean, as in v. 16, "the message heard," and this comes from the

message sent, which is "*The word of God*" (*όρνα Θεοῦ*). This last expression, therefore, does not mean precisely "God's bidding," His command to the preachers to go forth, a meaning for which Meyer appeals to Luke iii. 2, iv. 4, v. 5; Heb. i. 3, xi. 3; but the message with which they are sent from God, and which of course implies the sending spoken of in v. 15. Compare John iii. 34: "*He whom God bath sent speaketh the words of God*"; and John xvii. 8: "*I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me.*" "*The words of God*" (*όρνα*) prove the sending.

In the passage of Isaiah, "*our report*," i.e. the message heard from us, includes both the hearing and preaching of v. 14, and therefore preaching, though not expressly named, is implied in the sequence *faith, bearing, the word of God*. This view is confirmed by v. 18, where the question, "Have they (the bearers) not heard?" is answered by "their sound (the preachers') went forth."

The sending of the preachers by God is derived from the quotation not as an inference "from the mere address '*Lord*,' which is only added by LXX, but rather from the whole attitude of the Prophet as the servant and ambassador of God, speaking by His word or command" (Meyer). On the various reading "word of Christ" see note at end.

18. *But I say,*] After showing generally what was necessary in order that man might believe, the Apostle now inquires into the possible excuses that might be made for the unbelief of the Jews, and refutes them from their own scriptures.

*Have they not heard?*] Better, "*Is it that they did not hear?*" The form of the question in Greek shows at once that the excuse cannot be admitted: "Surely the message did not remain unheard by them?" (Meyer).

*Yes verily,*] Rather, "*Nay verily:*" see ix. 20. The answer corrects the suggestion "that they did not hear," by asserting that the Gospel has been preached in all the world. This assertion the Apostle clothes in the words of Ps. xix. 4. In the Psalm "*their sound*" is the voice of nature, the silent witness with which "*the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handywork*." The Psalmist compares this universal revelation of

<sup>\* Deut. 32. 21.</sup> **19** But I say, Did not Israel know? First Moses saith, "I will provoke you to jealousy by them that are no people, and by a foolish nation I will anger you.

<sup>\* Is. 65. 1.</sup> **20** But Esaias is very bold, and saith, "I was found of them that

God in His works (*vv. 1–6*) with His special revelation of Himself in His word (*vv. 7–11*); and the Apostle catches the very spirit of the Psalmist when he uses his words to describe how "*the sound*" of the preachers of the Gospel "*is gone out into all the earth, and their words into the ends of the world.*" The poetical language thus borrowed from the Psalm must not, of course, be pressed with literal exactness; its use was justified by the great extent to which the Gospel had already been diffused throughout the world, and everywhere addressed to the Jews first. At the date of this Epistle, the Gospel had been preached almost in every place where a settled body of Jews were living, so that even those of the Dispersion had not the excuse of not having heard it.

**19–21.** Another possible excuse suggested, and refuted by Scripture.

**19.** *But I say,*] Observe the "emphatic conformity" (Meyer) gained by repeating the words, "*But I say*," from *v. 18*.

Observe also how in the increasing urgency and closeness of the question St. Paul expressly names "*Israel*," whom he had meant in *v. 16*, "*they have not all obeyed the Gospel.*" In the right order of the Greek words (Tischendorf 8), "*Israel*" is emphatic.

*Did not Israel know?*] Rather, "**Did Israel not know?**" "Was it that they heard, but did not perceive the meaning of the things spoken?" (Chrysostom). Did they not understand that the message of salvation was to be sent to every nation, and that the Gentiles would receive it gladly? They knew this from the very beginning, for the first to declare it (*πρώτος*) is Moses himself.

In the song of Moses (Deut. xxxii. 21) the voice of God is heard declaring that as Israel had moved Him to jealousy by worshipping that which is "not God," so He on His part will make them jealous by showing favour to them which are "no-people," i.e. to those who were not included in the special covenant by which God had made Israel His own people (Ex. xix. 6; Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2).

Both the figure and language of Moses are repeated by Hosea (i. 9, ii. 2, 23). Compare C. ix. 25; 1 Pet. ii. 10.

*by them that are no people,*] Rather,

sought me not; I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me.

**21** But to Israel he saith, <sup>\* All</sup> <sup>Is. 65. 1.</sup> day long I have stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.

"**against that which is no people.**" The quotation is from the LXX, who have neglected the distinction in the Hebrew between "people" and "nation;" this is rightly restored in the A. V.

Since "*the people of God*" alone answers to the true idea of a "people," any "nation" that knows not God contradicts this idea and is a "not people" (Lo-ammi). St. Paul makes the application more direct and personal by changing "*I will provoke them*" into "*I will provoke you.*" See Notes on Deut. xxxii. 21.

*and by a foolish nation.*] Rather, **against a nation void of understanding:** i.e. I will stir you to anger by taking into my favour those who have hitherto shown their foolishness by worshipping idols of wood and stone.

St. Paul rightly regards the Divine warning uttered by Moses as intended for every age of Israel's history; and therefore applies it to the acceptance of the Gospel by Greeks and Romans and other idolatrous Gentiles in his own day: comp. i. 21.

**20.** *But Esaias is very bold.*] Rather, "**But Esaias breaks out boldly.**" The quotation is from Isaiah lxv. 4: "*I am sought of them that asked not for me: I am found of them that sought me not.*"

St. Paul retains the words of the LXX, but inverts the order of the parallel clauses, thereby bringing into greater prominence that one which more clearly expresses the reception of the Gentiles, "*I was found of them that sought me not.*" That the original passage in its primary sense refers to the Heathen, and not (as Meyer and others assert) to the Jews, seems clear from comparing the words, "*a nation that was not called by my name*" (lxv. 1) with lxiii. 19, "*We are thine: thou never barest rule over them: they were not called by thy name.*" [See this Commentary on the passage.] The tenses cannot in Isaiah refer to events already past, as no Heathen nation had then been brought in: they are the usual tenses of prophecy, anticipating its fulfilment, which in St. Paul's day was already an accomplished fact.

"*Asked not after me,*" i.e. who inquired not of me, but of other gods. Compare Num. xxvii. 21; Josh. ix. 14; Jud. i. 1; xx. 18; Isaiah viii. 19; xix. 3.

**21.** *But to Israel,*] "But in reference to

Israel," or more briefly, "*But of Israel*." On this use of *πρός* see Luke xx. 19, "against," rather "concerning," and Heb. i. 8, "unto the Son," rather, "of the Son."

The direct address to *Israel* does not begin till Isa. lxv. 7.

"*be saith*," namely, Isaiah speaking in God's name.

"All day long I have stretched forth my bands." "All the day long I have spread

**out my hands.**" It is a picture of "*the everlasting arms*" spread open in unwearied love: St. Paul again changes the order, giving more emphasis to the words "all the day long," which express God's patience and long-suffering towards His own people (*λαόν*), though they persist in disobeying and refusing His invitations.

The idea of the whole chapter is briefly summed up in these last words,

### ADDITIONAL NOTES on vv. 4, 15, 17.

4. Besides the meaning of *τέλος* given in the foot-note, two other senses have been ascribed to it; (1) completion, (2) aim.

(1) "Christ is the completion (*perfectio*) of the law, and Christ is righteousness:—and he who receives not Christ, cannot complete even that righteousness which is of the law." (Origen: Cyril, *πλήρωμα*; Erasmus, "perfectio;" Calvin, "complementum;" Calovius, "Christ's fulfilment and satisfaction of the law by His active and passive obedience."

But this sense of completion is wrongly ascribed to *τέλος* even in 1 Tim. i. 5, and Ja. v. 11: as to Luke xxii. 37, compare Mark iii. 26.

(2) "This then was the end of the law, and to this all looked, the feasts, and the ordinances, and the sacrifices, that man might be justified. "But this end Christ accomplished in a greater way through faith . . . so that if you believe Him, you have also fulfilled the law even much more fully than it commanded, for you have received a much greater righteousness" (Chrysostom, Gennadius).

This sense of *τέλος* is found in 1 Pet. i. 9, and 1 Tim. i. 5; it has also been explained in another way, as follows:

"The law was given for this purpose to lead us by the hand to another righteousness: yea, in all that the law teaches, enjoins, or promises, it always has Christ for its aim" (Calvin, following Theodoret, Cyril, &c.).

All these interpretations are inconsistent with the context, which sets "*the righteousness which is of law*" in direct opposition to "*the righteousness which is of faith*."

15. The omission of the former clause, *τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων εἰρήνην*, is approved by Lachmann, Tisch. 8, and Tregelles; but Meyer regards it as a copyist's error of a very usual kind. An interpolator would have taken the words of the LXX *ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης*, not *εἰρήνην*. Moreover, the genuineness of *εἰρήνην* is confirmed by St. Paul's allusions to the same passage in Eph. ii. 17, καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐηγελίσατο εἰρήνην, and in Eph. vi. 15, ἐν ἔτοιμαρι τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς εἰρήνης.

17. The various reading διὰ ρήματος Χριστοῦ has about equal weight of authority, and is preferred by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles. But Meyer, De Wette, Lange, Philippi, &c., agree in regarding it as a gloss intended to define more precisely the meaning of διὰ ρήματος Θεοῦ.

## CHAPTER XI.

I God hath not cast off all Israel. 7 Some were elected, though the rest were hardened. 16 There is hope of their conversion. 18 The Gentiles may not insult upon them: 26 for there is a promise of their salvation. 33 God's judgments are unsearchable.

I SAY then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin.

2 God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew. Wot ye

### CHAP. XI.—THE RESTORATION.

1. *I say then, Hath God cast away his people?*] A third question, corresponding to those in x. 18, 19, but expressed as an inference from what has just been said of Israel's disobedience—an inference, however, which is only brought forward to be at once rejected, as the very form of the question (*μή*) shows—"Surely

God has not cast off His people?" Can it be that the reception of the Gentiles means that Israel is cast off and excluded from the promised salvation? Can God have dealt thus with *His own people*? That very title anticipated the answer, "for the Lord will not fail *bis people*, neither will he forsake his inheritance" (Ps. xciv. 14): compare 1 Sam. xii. 22.

On the expression, "*God forbid*," see iii. 4.

<sup>1 Kings  
19. 14.</sup> not what the scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying,

3 "Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life."

It is not a denial followed by its *proof*, but an earnest *deprecation* explained by its *motive*: "For I also am an Israelite." No true Israelite could bear the thought that God had cast away His people: and St. Paul, in feeling as in blood, was a very Hebrew of the Hebrews, "of the seed of Abram," and not a mere proselyte,—"of the tribe of Benjamin," which alone with Judah formed the core of the Theocracy at the division of the kingdom and after the captivity: compare Phil. iii. 5.

2. The direct denial here follows, and is strengthened by the further description of Israel as God's "people which be foreknew."

The subject of the whole chapter from v. 1 is the *national* destiny of the Jews. This forbids us to limit God's "people whom be foreknew" to a spiritual Israel, foreknown and predestined to be saved through their reception of the Gospel.

The true meaning is that Israel the nation—"all Israel" (v. 26)—is God's "people which be foreknew" as his people: His people, therefore, Israel still is, and must be for ever; it cannot have been cast away, "for the gifts and calling of God are without repentance" (v. 29).

*Wot ye not what the scripture saith of Elias?* Rather, "Or know ye not what the scripture saith in [the history of] Elias?"

On the introductory phrase, "Or know ye not," see vi. 16: it means here, You must admit that "God has not cast away his people;" or else you must be strangely ignorant of what the Scripture says in proof of this in another similar case.

"In Elias." Elias is here the name of the Parashah, or section of the Hebrew Scriptures, concerning Elias. These sections were originally denoted not by numbers, but by a brief description of the contents: thus Philo Jud. 'de Agricultura Noachi' xxiv., "in the curses" (Gen. iii. 15); Raschi on Ps. ii., "as is said in Abner" (2 Sam. ii. 8 ff.); and on Hos. ix. 9, "in the concubine" (Jud. xix.); Berachoth f. 2, c. 1, "in Michael" (Is. vi. 6) f. 4, c. 2, "in Gabriel" (Dan. ix. 21).

*maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying, Lord, &c.* Rather, *pleadeth with God against Israel: Lord, &c.* "Intercession" is never against, but always on behalf of some one.

3. The passage is quoted freely from 1 Ki.

4 But what saith the answer of God unto him? <sup>b</sup>I have reserved to myself <sup>a 1 Kings  
19. 18.</sup> seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the *image of Baal*.

5 Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace.

xix. 10 and 14: for the particulars see the Notes there given in this Commentary.

The assumption that Elijah means, "I am left alone of the *prophets*," is inconsistent with the context, which certainly does not speak of seven thousand *prophets*, but of seven thousand faithful worshippers of Jehovah: so Theodore. There is thus no diversity between Elijah's meaning and St. Paul's application of his words.

4. *the answer of God*] The Greek word (*χρηματισμός*) thus rightly rendered means a "communication," either from man (2 Macc. xi. 17), or from God (2 Macc. ii. 4). Here it is the answer made by the "still small voice."

*I have reserved to myself.*] Rather, "I have left for myself." I have caused a *remnant* (v. 5) to remain.

The passage in its original context (1 Kings xix. 18) stands in connexion with the future chastisements which Israel was to suffer by the agency of Hazael, Jehu, and Elisha: but amid this destruction of the disobedient, "I have left," God says, or rather, as in the margin, "I will leave," "seven thousand" i.e. I have in my purpose already determined not to destroy them with the disobedient. St. Paul brings the passage into immediate connexion with the Prophet's lament that he is left alone: there were, unknown to him, many true worshippers of Jehovah, whom God would leave as a remnant, when the wicked should perish.

"seven thousand" is to be regarded as a round number. There is nothing in the Hebrew corresponding to the words "for myself" (*ἐμαυτῷ*), which St. Paul adds to bring out more emphatically the thought that the remnant is preserved by God Himself for His own gracious purpose. The way is thus prepared for the mention of an "election of grace" in v. 5.

*who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal.*] Rather, *which have not bowed knee to Baal.* The Apostle gives here a free paraphrase, and brings into prominence the characteristic of the remnant preserved: they are men that (*οἵτινες*) never bowed knee to Baal.

On the feminine *τῆς Βάαλ*, see notes on Jud. ii. 13, x. 6; 1 Sam. vii. 4; Hos. ii. 8, 10, 15, and Jeremiah, *passim*.

6 And if by grace, then *is it no more of works*: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if *it be of works*, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work.

7 What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for;

but the election hath obtained it, and the rest <sup>1</sup>were blinded.

8 (According as it is written, "God hath given them the spirit of <sup>1</sup>slumber, <sup>2</sup>eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear;") unto this day.

*5. Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace.]* The Greek word (*kaupós*) denotes the character of a time, and St. Paul likens his own time to Elijah's, because each was a season of general but not universal apostasy and unbelief in Israel. The resemblance of the times shows that God is dealing with Israel upon the same principles; and so from the Divine answer to Elijah the Apostle draws the inference (*oōv*) that in his time also God has left a remnant for himself; in other words, "there has come to be (*γέγονεν*) a remnant according to an election" not of merit, but "of grace."

The existence of this "remnant" of believing Jews is the proof that God has not rejected His people as a people (*v. 2*).

*6. And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace.]* Rather, "And if by grace, it is no more of works: since otherwise the grace becomes no longer grace." The negative as well as the positive side of the election of grace is essential to the inference which St. Paul draws in the next verse: for Israel seeks to obtain "of works" that which is not of works: compare ix. 32. "The grace" presupposed in the election of the remnant excludes all dependence upon works, for otherwise it ceases to be "grace" at all, losing its proper character as the opposite of merit.

The latter part of the verse, "But if it be of works," &c., is rightly omitted in most critical texts.

*7. What then?] What conclusion as to the present state of Israel must be drawn from the truths just stated?*

*Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for.]* Rather, "What Israel is seeking after, that obtained he not." Israel, the mass of the people, has been and still is seeking after righteousness, the very thing that he has failed to obtain. St. Paul does not stay to define the object which Israel seeks, nor to state that he sought it not aright, because this has been done before in ix. 32 and x. 3, and the principles asserted in those passages have just been most emphatically repeated in *v. 6*.

It is thus made clear that the believing Jews are saved, like the Gentiles, "by grace through faith" (Eph. ii. 8), and that "the rest

were hardened," not because God had "rejected his people," but because they sought to establish their own righteousness by works, and "submitted not unto the righteousness of God" (*x. 3*).

*the election.]* The Abstract Noun gives precision of thought, as well as vivacity and force of expression: "the elect as *elect*" (Bengel).

*were blinded.]* Rather, "were hardened." Compare 2 Cor. iii. 14, and see note on Mark iii. 5, and at the end of this chapter. That God is here regarded as the author of the hardening, is clear from the Scripture proof that follows.

8. St. Paul now shows that the hardening of Israel against the Gospel is in accordance with the testimony of Moses concerning their hardening in his day, and with Isaiah's prophecy of the continuance of this hardening. Compare Isaiah vi. 9, 10.

Two passages are in the Apostle's mind: Isaiah xxix. 9, 10: "They are drunken, but not with wine; they stagger, but not with strong drink. For the Lord hath poured out upon you the spirit of deep sleep, and hath closed your eyes": and Deut. xxix. 4: "Yet the Lord HATH NOT GIVEN YOU AN HEART TO PERCEIVE, AND EYES TO SEE, AND EARS TO HEAR, UNTO THIS DAY."

The quotation is evidently taken from the latter passage, with the expression "the spirit of slumber," adopted from Isaiah, and a corresponding change in the position of the negative, on which see below.

The words "unto this day" are part of the quotation from Deuteronomy, and are not to be directly connected with *v. 7*: the brackets of A. V. must therefore be omitted.

*the spirit of slumber.]* Meyer understands by this "a spirit which causes stupefaction, which is obviously a daemonic spirit." But such expressions as "the spirit of heaviness" (Is. lxi. 3), "a spirit of meekness" (1 Cor. iv. 21), "the spirit of bondage" (c. viii. 15) show that "spirit" is used for the pervading tendency and tone of mind, the special character of which is denoted by the Genitive which follows.

Though it is true that this "spirit of slumber" is the result of a "reciprocal process between man's unbelief and God's judgments" (Lange), yet in this passage St. Paul

Ps. 69.  
22.

9 And David saith, ‘Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumbling-block, and a recompence unto them:

/ Ps. 69.  
23.

10 / Let their eyes be darkened,

speaks only of the judicial hardening, and ascribes this even more expressly than do the original passages to God's will and purpose, by turning the words “*the Lord bath not given you . . . eyes to see*” into the stronger statement, “*God hath given them . . . eyes that they should not see.*” Observe also that the Apostle already had this stronger form of expression before his mind in the quotation which follows from Ps. lix. 23, 24.

*slumber.]* The Hebrew word in Is. xxix. 10, means “a deep sleep,” such as fell on Adam, Gen. ii. 21, on Abraham, Gen. xv. 12, on Saul's attendants, 1 Sam. xxvi. 12; compare Job iv. 13, xxxiii. 15, Prov. xix. 15.

The Greek word (*καρυβίεως*) might have been applied, like the verb from which it is derived, to any piercing and overpowering stroke, as of remorse (Acts ii. 37), grief, pain, or fear; but it is in fact used only to denote *stupefaction*, in this passage of Isaiah and in Ps. lx. 3 “the wine of astonishment.”

**9, 10. And David saith.]** On the authorship of Ps. lix, see note in this commentary. We may add that besides this Psalm (cited here and in Acts i. 20), only the ii., xvi., xxxii., and cx. are expressly ascribed to David in N. T., and the authorship of these is hardly to be questioned. Ps. xciv, quoted in Heb. iv. 7, is less certain, and the form of citation “*saying in David*,” does not necessarily mean more than “*saying in the Book of Psalms*:” see introductory note on Ps. xciv.

*Let their table be made a snare.]* For the full interpretation of the passage, see notes on the Psalm, and at the end of this chapter. The Psalmist, in the bitterness of a soul wrought almost to madness by the cruelty of his enemies, calls for just vengeance upon them: let their prosperity and false peace be a snare and a trap, to keep them in blindness and in bondage for ever. St. Paul uses the passage, not merely as an illustration, but as a typical Prophecy of the retribution which had fallen upon the Jews for their cruel rejection of the Messiah.

The “*table*” spread for a feast is a natural emblem of the prosperity and careless ease by which the heart is ensnared “as a wild beast grasps at food, and falls into a trap.”

**10. On the “darkening of the eyes” as a figure of the spiritual blindness denounced upon Israel, see Isaiah vi. 9, 10, and the notes there.** Fritzsche's view, followed by

that they may not see, and bow down their back alway.

**11 I say then, Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid: but rather through their fall**

Godet, that this judicial blindness was the *cause*, not the *consequence*, of the rejection of Christ, is inconsistent with the position of the passage in the Psalm, and the order of ideas there, and especially with the word “*recompense*” or “*retribution*” (v. 9), which St. Paul adopts from the LXX, giving it at the same time a more emphatic place at the end of the sentence.

*And bow down their back alway.]* St. Paul throughout this verse follows the LXX exactly: the Hebrew is rendered literally in the A. V., “make their loins continually to shake.” The shaking of the loins is a symptom of weakness and terror (Nahum ii. 10; Dan. v. 6), for which the LXX substitute the corresponding symptom, the bowing down or bending together of the back.

These figurative expressions, when applied to the Jews, denote spiritual blindness and hopeless dejection.

**11-15. After alleging the fulfilment of prophecy in the hardening of the Jews, St. Paul now shows that the purpose of this Divine retribution is not the final rejection of Israel, but the reconciliation of the world. Their rejection has been shown to be *partial*: it will also be *temporary*.**

**11. Have they stumbled that they should fall?] Better, “Did they stumble in order that they might fall?**

The two ideas “to stumble” and “to fall” form a natural climax in which the emphasis rests on the latter.

Both words are used figuratively; the former of a moral offence or stumbling, as in James ii. 10, iii. 2, the particular offence here meant being disbelief of Christ, for “*they stumbled at that stumbling stone*,” ix. 32: while the latter word expresses the consequent fall from God's favour into a state of condemnation and ruin: compare Heb. iv. 11 and James v. 12. The meaning then of the verse is briefly this: “The Jews stumbled at Christ: is that stumbling destined in the Divine purpose to end in their fall?”

The form of the question in the Greek (*μή*) implies the negative answer which follows, “*Far be it*,” or “*God forbid*.”

*but rather through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles.]* Better,—“*But by their offence the salvation is come to the Gentiles.*” The stumbling of the Jews

salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy.

<sup>For, de-</sup> 12 Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the <sup>the</sup> diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fulness?

is here called “*their offence*,” the word being the same that is used so often in ch. v. 15 ff. The rejection by the Jews of the salvation offered to them in Christ, and the increasing violence of their opposition, had in fact greatly promoted the preaching of the Gospel among the Gentiles (Acts viii. 4, xi. 19) and its consequent acceptance by them. In St. Paul’s own experience this had been the case at Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiii. 45–48), it was to be so again at Rome itself (Acts xxviii. 28). In this fact he recognises the fulfilment of the Divine purpose foretold in the passage of Deuteronomy already called to mind in x. 19. The transfer of God’s favour to the Gentiles, thus caused by the perversity of the Jews, was destined, in His gracious purpose, to provoke the jealousy and so to rekindle the love of His ancient people; their recovery and not their fall was His aim.

But what a prospect is thus opened!

12. Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world,] Rather, “*But if their offence be the riches of the world!*” If even the transgression of the chosen people has brought salvation to the Gentiles, and if their loss or diminution has thus been “*the riches of the world!*” how much more shall the promise of blessing to all nations be fulfilled in their restoration and fulness when “*all Israel shall be saved,*” v. 26.

This hope, that the final restoration of Israel shall be a source of great joy and blessing to the world, is here inferred from the nature of the case, that the better cause must be followed by the happier effect: but it is already contained in that prophetic song of Moses, which St. Paul has quoted in x. 19, and which he quotes again in xv. 10 “*Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people.*”

*the diminishing of them,*] The contrast throughout is not between the elect remnant and the rest who were hardened, but between Israel as a nation and the rest of the world. Viewed thus, as a whole, Israel has stumbled but not fallen, has been hardened but in part, has suffered loss and *diminution* by the unbelief of some, but shall be restored to its *full complement*, when “*the Deliverer shall come out of Zion, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob,*” v. 26.

*their fulness?*] I.e. their full complement,

13 For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office:

14 If by any means I may provoke to emulation *them which are my flesh*, and might save some of them.

as a nation no longer diminished by the loss of a large portion, but forming again one entire people. See note at the end on the meaning of the Greek words *ἡττημα* and *πλήρωμα*.

13. St. Paul now turns to his readers, addressing them collectively as Gentiles, and tries to impart to them some of his own warm interest in the welfare of the Jews.

From this point to the end of v. 32 the Apostle combines the hope of the restoration of the Jews with warnings to the Gentiles against presuming on their present advantages.

*For I speak to you Gentiles.] But to you Gentiles I am speaking.* This clause should be separated from the following by a colon: St. Paul first draws the attention of his readers to the fact that he is speaking to them, as being Gentiles, of that which closely concerns their welfare, namely, the future restoration of Israel.

It is rightly inferred from this passage that the Roman Christians were for the most part Gentiles: see Introduction, § 7.

*inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office:]* Rather, “*In so far, therefore, as I am an Apostle of the Gentiles, I glorify my ministry.*”

On the various readings see note at the end. In the words “*In so far as I am an Apostle of the Gentiles,*” St. Paul with his usual delicate courtesy and perfect mastery of Greek, implies that this is but one part (*μέρος*) of his ministry, chosen as he was to bear Christ’s name “*before Gentiles and kings and the children of Israel.*” But since the Gentile world is so deeply interested in the restoration of Israel, it follows (*therefore*) that even in his special relation to the Gentiles, when labouring most zealously for them and claiming full liberty and authority for himself as their Apostle, he still has in view the salvation of Israel as inseparably connected with the blessing of all the nations of the world.

14. *If by any means I may provoke to emulation *them which are my flesh*,*] Rather, “*If by any means I may provoke to jealousy mine own flesh and may save some of them.*” The word “*jealousy*” should be adopted as in v. 11 and x. 19; St. Paul retains the same word (*παραγλώσσαι*) throughout.

15 For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?

It may be admitted that the introduction of a different English word, “*emulation*,” brings out another shade of meaning, included in the Greek, and quite appropriate here; but this advantage is very small in comparison with the disadvantage of obscuring the connexion with v. 11 and with the original prophecy in Deut. xxxii. 16, 21. With the expression of warm affection “*mine own flesh*,” compare ix. 3, where the Singular Pronoun “*mine*,” not “*our*,” implies what is here expressly stated, that the readers are Gentiles.

St. Paul’s sense of the difficulty of persuading his fellow-countrymen is apparent in the modest phrase “*some of them*;” compare 1 Cor. ix. 22. (Meyer.)

15. The reason of the Apostle’s hope that he “*may save some*” is given in an argument à *fortiori* (compare v. 12) based upon the contrast between the rejection of Israel and their future readmission to God’s favour. If in casting off the greater portion of His ancient people because of their unbelief God found an occasion of reconciling the world unto Himself, how much greater blessing may be looked for when He shall receive them again as His own! What will that reception be but “*life from the dead?*”

This expression is not to be understood of a moral or spiritual resurrection, for that is already included as a necessary consequence in the reconciliation of the world and the restoration of Israel. Nor is it to be limited, as by Theodore and other Greek Fathers, to the resurrection of the body. It is a figurative expression which may denote either (1) an increase of spiritual fervour and blessing in the whole Church of Christ on earth, so great and wonderful as to be comparable to a resurrection from the dead; or (2) the new life of the world to come, the final development and glorious consummation of the kingdom of Christ. That blessed state, not only in its first stage,—the resurrection of the body—but in its whole character, as compared with the world that now is, will be a “*life from the dead.*” The “*new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness,*” will spring as it were from the ashes of a dead world into everlasting life.

The former view is the simpler and the more probable, because it does not pass beyond the bounds of the present context.

16. “After the Apostle has disclosed his prospect of the glorious results of Israel’s

16 For if the firstfruit be holy, the lump is also holy: and if the root be holy, so are the branches.

17 And if some of the branches

conversion, he returns to the grounds for the hope of this conversion itself” (Lange). Rather, St. Paul passes on (δέ) to a further argument for the restoration of the Jews, namely, that it is in accordance with the original consecration of the race.

*For if the first-fruit be holy, the lump is also holy; and if the root be holy, so are the branches.* [Rather, “If, too, the first fruit be holy, so also is the lump; and if the root be holy, so also are the branches.”]

The first figure is taken from Num. xv. 19–21, where “*the first of the dough*” is “*the first-fruit of the lump*” (*πρώτη φυραμός*), a portion set aside from the kneading to make a cake for a heave-offering (Neh. x. 37). The first-fruit thus offered to the Lord imparted its consecration to the whole mass which it was taken to represent. In the second figure, instead of a legal ordinance we have a natural process, the branch deriving its properties from the root.

In the interpretation of both figures the fundamental thought is certainly the same, that all Israel has been consecrated to God by the consecration of its “*first-fruit*” and its “*root.*” But what are these?

(1) Both figures represent the Patriarchs, especially Abraham. (Chrysostom, and the majority of ancient and modern interpreters.)

(2) “I know no other root that is holy, no holy first-fruit, but our Lord Jesus Christ.” (Origen.)

(3) “He calls the Lord Christ according to His human nature ‘the first-fruit,’ and the patriarch Abraham the root.” (Theodore and others.)

(4) The Jews who formed the Mother Church are “*the first-fruit*,” and “*the root*” also, as some think.

It is clear that neither Christ nor the Christian Church can be “*the root*” from which “*the natural branches*” were broken off: for these branches, the Jews who rejected Christ, never belonged to such a root. The branches being the Jews, the root can only be Abraham and the Patriarchs: compare v. 28, and ix. 5.

This interpretation is further confirmed by the fact that St. Paul’s figure of the olive tree, with its root and branches, is derived from the Old Testament, where it is applied to the Theocracy or Jewish Church. Of this Jeremiah writes, xi. 16: “*The Lord call'd thy name, A green olive tree, fair, and of goodly fruit; with the noise of a great tumult (i.e. a*

*For, for  
them.*

be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree;

18 Boast not against the branches.

thunderstorm) *be bath kindled fire upon it, and the branches of it are broken.*" Of this also Hosea says (xiv. 6): "His branches shall spread, and his beauty shall be as the olive tree."

The holiness derived from "the Fathers" to their children was not inward moral holiness, but consecration to God by virtue of His choice of Abraham and his seed, declared by the word of promise and confirmed by the covenant of circumcision: compare 1 Cor. vii. 14.

In the first figure of the dough made holy by the offering of its first-fruit, no other kind of holiness can possibly be thought of but this legal and relative holiness of what has been consecrated to God. With so much identity of thought, combined with the parallelism of form, it is impossible to give totally different applications to the two figures, as is done by making the first-fruit Christ or the Christian Church, and Abraham the root. The usual interpretation (1) is alone admissible.

17-24. St. Paul carries on the second figure of the root and the branches, because it admits of a distinction between one branch and another, and so can be applied, collectively or individually, to believers and unbelievers, to Jews and also to Gentiles. In his application of the figure to the present position both of Jews and Gentiles, the Apostle finds a warning to the latter against boasting and unbelief (17-22), and a fresh argument for the restoration of the Jews (23, 24).

17. *And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree.*] Rather, "But if some of the branches were broken off, and thou, being a wild olive, wast grafted in among them, and wast made partaker of the root and fatness of the olive tree." The Church of God being regarded as one and the same in all ages, having Abraham for its root and his children for its "natural branches," it follows that "some of the branches were broken off" when the unbelieving Jews by rejecting Christ ceased to belong to the true people of God. Extending his allegory to the Gentile world, St. Paul compares it to "*a wild olive tree,*" unfruitful in itself, but supplying grafts to be inserted into the good olive tree and enriched by its fatness: such a graft of *wild olive* is the individual reader.

Grafting of the wild shoot on the fruitful

But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee.

19 Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in.

stock is the reverse of the common method; and though sometimes practised, it was not intended to fertilise the wild olive, but to give fresh vigour to the fruitful stock, as is clear from Palladius:

"Fœcundat sterilis pingues oleaster olivas,  
Et quæ non novit munera ferre, docet."

The grafting of the good olive upon the wild is mentioned by Aristotle, "de Plantis," I. vi. 4, "Εστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλος εμφύλλισμός ἐν ἀλλοῖς διαφόροις γένεσιν, ὡς καλλιεῖται εἰς ἀγριελαιον.

St. Paul's words do not correspond exactly to either practice: he seems rather to have shaped his allegory to correspond to the facts which he wished to represent, viz., that the Gentiles had been enriched by admission to the privileges which some of God's ancient people had forfeited through unbelief, v. 18. These facts forbid boasting, and rather supply a warning to the Gentiles: and by singling out, as it were, one of his readers and addressing him personally, the Apostle both makes the warning more emphatic, and excludes all boasting against the Jews by reminding the Gentiles that they are not the original Church of Christ, but members adopted into it one by one: "But if thou dost boast, it is not thou that bearest the root, but the root thee."

This passage shows that St. Paul recognised as fully as any of the original Apostles the dependence of all Gentile churches upon the one Church of Christ which had grown out of the root of Israel.

19. One ground of boasting having been excluded in v. 18, another may be sought: "Thou wilt say then, Branches were broken off, in order that I might be grafted in."

St. Paul has just said that the rejection of the Jews was, in fact, the enriching of the Gentiles; but it would be arrogant and selfish to assume, as in this supposed reply, that the advantage of the Gentiles was the direct and sole cause of God's casting away any of His people. The selfishness is indicated in the emphatic "I."

The absence of the article before "branches" brings out the point, that they who were broken off to make room were original "branches;" their essential character thus indicated makes the fact that they were broken off more remarkable.

**20** Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear:

**21** For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee.

**22** Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which

fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.

**23** And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graft them in again.

**24** For if thou wert cut out of the

**20. Well;**] A form of partial and often ironical assent: here the fact, and the purpose which it was made to serve, being both admitted, St. Paul goes on to correct a false inference from Israel's rejection by indicating its principal and direct cause: “*Because of their unbelief they were broken off, and by thy faith thou standest.*” Their rejection thus viewed in its true cause, namely, “*their unbelief,*” gives no occasion for boasting that thou art preferred to them, but is rather a solemn warning to hold fast “*thy faith,*” as the condition on which alone “*thou standest*” safe in thy place as a branch on the tree. Therefore “*be not highminded*” because of thy privilege, but rather be the more afraid of falling, as they have fallen.

**21.** Enforcement of the warning: if notwithstanding their greater privilege “*God spared not the natural branches*” when they sinned, much more reason hast thou to fear that He will not spare thee, who art only one of the adopted branches. The reader addressed in the Singular is throughout the representative of the Gentiles.

*take heed lest be also spare not thee.]* Read, “*neither will he spare thee.*” The shorter reading (omitting  $\mu\eta\pi\omega\sigma$ ) is now generally accepted. The variations may have sprung from a wish to soften the stern note of warning. But even in the reading followed by the A. V. the future indicative points to a real danger: “neither, it is to be feared, will he spare thee.”

**22. Behold therefore the goodness, &c.]** “*Behold therefore goodness and severity in God: on them which fell, severity; but on thee God's goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: since otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.*” The general meaning of the verse is not affected by the slight variations of the text. The way to continue in God's goodness (or in His “grace,” Acts xiii. 43) is to “*continue in the faith,*” Col. i. 23, not turning away in unbelief from the mercy bestowed. The Apostle with masterly skill sets both sides of the case at once before his readers, that “*goodness and severity*” seen side by side may stir both love and fear.

**23. And they also, if they abide not still in**

*unbelief, &c.]* Rather, “**And they moreover if they continue not in their unbelief,**” &c. A new thought is here brought in to check any false presumption based upon the rejection of the Jews. That rejection is not absolute and final: if their unbelief cease, as it may cease, they shall be restored to their former position. Unlikely as such a conversion may seem, it is not impossible: “*for God is able to graft them in again.*” Why does St. Paul thus appeal to the power of God? Various answers are given.

(a) To show that the only hindrance is Israel's unbelief, there being no lack of power on God's side. (Grotius.)

(b) To meet the difficulty suggested by the figure: “When branches are broken from a tree, they wither and cannot be replaced. Paul therefore here refers to the power of God. What is not done in nature, and cannot be effected by the power of man, will be done by God, with whom all things are possible.” (Haldane.)

The former answer is inadequate: St. Paul's custom is to appeal to the power of God only for that which lies beyond the usual course of His providence. See iv. 21, ix. 22, xiv. 4, &c.

The latter answer errs by pressing the figure too far, and so bringing in a thought inconsistent with the context; for in the next verse St. Paul argues that the branches which have been broken off are *more likely* to be restored than the strange shoot to be grafted in.

Quite apart from the figure of the olive tree and its branches, the difficulty of Israel's restoration is the thought that burdens the Apostle's mind throughout this portion of the Epistle; so that, after affirming the possibility of that restoration, it is most natural for him to point to the ground of that possibility in the almighty power which is able not merely to restore Israel, if the hindrance of their unbelief is removed, but able also to remove that unbelief itself. The interpretation of the passage does not call for any metaphysical discussion of the relation of God's power to man's free will: for St. Paul passes at once to a simply practical illustration of the Divine power in the conversion of the Gentiles.

**24. For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted**

olive tree which is wild by nature, and were grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree: how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree?

*contrary to nature into a good olive tree:]* Rather, “*For if thou wast cut off from thy native wild olive tree, and grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree,*”

“The simple meaning of this verse is that the future restoration of the Jews is *in itself* a more probable event than had been the introduction of the Gentiles into the Church of God. This of course supposes that God regarded the Jews, on account of their relation to Him, with peculiar favour, and that there is still something in their relation to the ancient servants of God and His covenant with them, which causes them to be regarded with special interest.” (Hodge.)

25-27. The future conversion of Israel having been proved to be both possible and probable, is now shown to be the subject of direct revelation. What follows is thus a confirmation of the hope expressed in v. 24: —“*they shall be grafted in,*”—for I have something more to make known to you on this subject. The phrase, “*I would not that ye should be ignorant,*” addressed, as it always is, by St. Paul to his “brethren,” indicates (as in 1. 13; 1 Cor. x. 1, xii. 1; 2 Cor. i. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 13) the Apostle’s anxiety to draw special attention to some important truth.

The word “mysteries” denotes in classical Greek certain secret religious ceremonies to which only the initiated were admitted. From the ancient traditions and interpretations connected with these ceremonies, and invested with the same secrecy, the word “mystery” easily acquired the sense, which it bears in the Septuagint, “a secret.” Thus in Dan. ii. 18, 19, &c., it is the “secret” of the king’s dream, which none can make known but God, ὁ ἀποκαλύπτων μυστήρια. Compare Job xi. 6; Wisdom ii. 22, “*As for the mysteries of God, they knew them not: neither hoped they for the wages of righteousness, nor discerned a reward for blameless souls.*” In Ecclesiasticus xxii. 22, xxvii. 16, &c., ἀποκαλύπτειν μυστήρια is “*to disclose secrets.*” Bp. Lightfoot (on Col. i. 27) says that “the idea of *secrecy* or *reserve* disappears when μυστήριον is adopted into the Christian vocabulary by St. Paul, and the word signifies simply a truth which was once hidden but now is revealed.” But in the Gospels the idea of *secrecy* or *reserve* is evidently retained (Matt. xiii. 11; Mark iv. 11; Luke viii. 10), and the word is applied only to the things of the kingdom of heaven which under

25 For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that “blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in.

the veil of parables were made known to those who were ready to believe, but remained still hidden from the unenlightened.

In a similar sense St. Paul applies the word to “divine secrets,” truths unknown till God reveals them (1 Cor. iv. 1; xiii. 2; xiv. 2; xv. 51).

Thus the divine purpose of salvation preached to the Gentile Church at Corinth is called the “*wisdom of God in a mystery,*” i.e. a divine secret, a truth which none could know till God revealed it (1 Cor. ii. 7, 10).

The meaning of the word in the passage before us is best illustrated by its use in Eph. i. 9, iii. 4, where God’s purpose to redeem all nations, and gather together in one all things in Christ, is called “*the mystery of His will,*” and “*the mystery of Christ,*” because in other ages it was not made known as it was revealed to the Apostles.

The same purpose of redemption here viewed in its special relation to Israel—i.e. God’s plan of making the obduracy of Israel subservient to the salvation of the Gentiles—is “*this mystery*” revealed to St. Paul, and by him made known to his readers, lest they should attribute it to their own superior wisdom that they had accepted what Israel had refused, and so “*be wise in their own conceits.*” This shows that the “*brethren*” addressed are Gentiles.

*that blindness in part is happened to Israel.]* Rather, “*That hardening has come in part upon Israel.*” Compare above v. 7 and Mark iii. 5; Eph. iv. 18. St. Paul joins ἀπὸ μέρους usually with a verb (2 Cor. i. 14, ii. 5; Rom. xv. 15, 24).

The hardening is not *universal*, but only “*in part*,” because the “*remnant according to the election of grace*” is not affected by it (v. 7): “*some of the branches*” only have been broken off (v. 17). Nor is the hardening *final*: it is to continue “*until the fulness of the Gentiles,*” (i.e. their full number or complement, as of the Jews in v. 12) “*shall have come in,*” into that community of the people of God, signified by the good olive tree, into which some of them have been already engrafted. On “*fulness*” ( $\pi\lambda\gamma\rho\omega\mu\alpha$ ), see Note on v. 12 at the end of the chapter.

The time thus indicated by St. Paul seems to be the same to which our Lord’s words point: *Jerusalem shall be trodden down of*

<sup>L 15. 59.  
22</sup> 26 And so all Israel shall be saved : as it is written, "There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob :

*the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled* (Luke xxi. 24).

26. *And so all Israel shall be saved* :] The A. V. rightly makes this the beginning of a new sentence, thereby giving greater prominence to a distinct and important prophecy. "And so" refers to the preceding sentence marking the coming in of the Gentiles as the condition upon which will follow the salvation of Israel.

As the antithesis of "*the Gentiles*" and "*Israel*" forbids us to interpret the latter of a spiritual Israel ("*the Israel of God*," Gal. vi.) including "*the whole people of God*" (Calvin), so the expression "*ALL Israel*" being quite unlimited must neither be narrowed down to "*the remnant according to election of grace*" (v. 7), by which the Apostle means the believing Jews of his own day, nor to "*the many thousands of Jews which believe*" mentioned in Acts xxi. 20, nor to the whole number of those who shall individually from time to time, even unto the end of the world, be turned to the Lord (Melanchthon). Neither on the other hand must the universality of the expression be exaggerated so as to mean the whole nation *without any individual exception*. The words must be taken in their natural unexaggerated sense as in 1 Kings xii. 1, 2 Chr. xii. 1; Dan. ix. 11; thus foretelling a future conversion of the Jews, so universal that the separation into an "*elect remnant*" and "*the rest who were hardened*" shall disappear, and the whole nation "*shall be saved*," i.e. be made partakers through faith in Jesus Christ of the long-promised salvation.

The passage in this its natural interpretation has no reference to the conclusions which some have sought to draw from it (1), that all men shall at last be saved eternally, and (2) that the Jewish Theocracy with its Temple, Priesthood, and earthly kingdom shall be re-established in Jerusalem. "Israel does not take in the Church, but the Church takes in Israel" (Meyer).

as it is written,] It is very possible that study of ancient prophecies may have been one mode in which St. Paul, like Daniel (ix. 2, 21, 22), was prepared to receive a revelation of the future destiny of Israel. We must not, however, suppose that he here quotes Is. lix. 20, 21, as the source of his own prediction, but only as a confirmation of the latter part of it, "*all Israel shall be saved*." The mystery which had been revealed to him

27 For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins.

28 As concerning the gospel, they

by the Spirit (1 Cor. ii. 10) he perceives to have been indicated long before in the words of Isaiah, "There shall come a Redeemer (Goîl) for Zion, and for them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord" (Hebrew literally rendered): LXX, "There shall come for Zion a Redeemer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." St. Paul, quoting the LXX from memory, substitutes "*from Zion*," led to it probably by reminiscences of such passages as Pss. xiv. 7, l. 2, liii. 7, cx. 2; Is. ii. 3, Mic. iv. 2. The undesigned variation, "*from Zion*," serves to show that the Apostle is thinking not of the Second Advent which must follow the Conversion of Israel, but of that first Advent in which Christ as revealed in the Gospel is still going forth from Jerusalem, and shall yet go forth in special power to redeem His people Israel. That full restoration of Israel will be for the whole world the beginning of a "*life from the dead*" (v. 15).

and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob:] St. Paul follows the LXX, who give the general sense with sufficient correctness for his purpose; the more literal rendering (see note on Is. 59, 23) "*and for them that turn from transgression in Jacob*," points at least as clearly to that unbelieving portion of the nation whose conversion will fulfil the prophecy that "*all Israel shall be saved*."

As this portion of the quotation describes the redeeming and converting work of Christ, so v. 27 shows God's forgiveness as the ground of the New Covenant.

27. *For this is my covenant unto them*,] A renewal of God's word to Abraham (Gen. xvii. 4) applied by Isaiah (lix. 21) to the new covenant, which he proceeds to describe: "*My spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.*"

The expression "*thy seed's seed*" seems to show that the promise is addressed to Israel, which having been hitherto partly faithful and partly unfaithful, has now returned to its fidelity.

For this description of the covenant St. Paul substitutes another taken from Is. xxvii. 9 (Septuag.) καὶ τοῦτο ἡ εὐλογία αὐτῶν, ὅταν ἀφέσουσι τὴν ἀμαρτίαν αὐτῶν, "And this is his blessing, when I shall have taken away his sin," which is more appropriate to his

*are enemies for your sakes: but as touching the election, they are beloved for the fathers' sakes.*

29 For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance.

present purpose as containing a promise that the sins of Israel shall be taken away.

See notes on ls. xxvii. 9, and compare Jer. xxxi. 31—34.

The fulfilment of St. Paul's prediction must be regarded as still future, being the last step in the universal diffusion of Christianity, and the prelude to Christ's second coming (Meyer).

28—32. The present alienation of Israel in contrast with God's unchanging promise to their fathers (28, 29) is part of the method by which He will extend His mercy to all nations, and so at last include both Jew and Gentile in one common salvation (30—32).

28. *As concerning the gospel, they are enemies]* i.e. enemies of God, treated by Him as enemies and shut out for a time from His mercy: and this is “*for your sakes*,” that you may receive that mercy from which they for their disobedience have been excluded. This passive sense of “enemies,” i.e. hated by God, is necessary as answering to “*beloved*” in the parallel clause. In what sense God hates the sinner, see in the note on v. 10.

*but as touching the election.]* Meyer, following Ewald, argues that “*the election*” having been defined in vv. 5—7 as “*the remnant according to election of grace*” must retain that meaning here: “but in regard to the election, that chosen remnant is a living witness that Israel is still beloved of God.”

This concrete sense of “*the election*” is, however, found only in v. 7, where it is explained by the context: and the usual interpretation, “as concerning God's choice of Israel to be his people”—answers better to the previous clause “*as concerning the gospel*.” The meaning then is, “If we look at the Divine election of Israel, wherein God chose not a mere remnant, but the people at large, they are still “*beloved for the fathers' sakes*,” because from them the promised blessing was transmitted to their children according to the form of the covenant—“*to thee and to thy seed*” (Calvin): compare Luke i. 54, 55.

29. The last thought is now confirmed by “an axiom truly apostolic” (Bengel) concerning the unchangeable nature of God's purpose. His acts of grace, His gifts or favours freely granted (*xapiorata*), and especially His calling, are “*without repentance*.” The word thus happily rendered means either “that is

30 For as ye in times past have not believed God, yet have now <sup>obeyed</sup> obtained mercy through their unbelief:

31 Even so have these also now

not repented of” (Plato, Legg. ix. 866, E.) or, “that cannot be repented of” (Polyb. xxiv. 12, 11): compare 2 Cor. vii. 10.

Godet interprets “*the gifts of God*” of the moral and intellectual qualities with which Israel was specially endowed for its peculiar mission to the world: but his argument that the word (*xapiorata*) “usually has this sense in St. Paul's Epistles” is not well founded, and his interpretation itself is fanciful: see note on *xapiorata*, i. 10.

30—32. The general truth alleged in v. 29 is corroborated by an explanation of the manner in which it will be realised in this particular instance.

The course of God's Providence towards Gentiles and Jews is summed up in a series of comparisons and contrasts, which are made more striking by close and continued parallelisms, the antithesis “*disobedience—mercy*” being thrice repeated in the three verses 30—32 (Forbes).

30. *For as ye in times past have not believed God, &c.]* Rather, “*For as ye in times past obeyed not God, yet have now obtained mercy by their disobedience, even so have these also now been disobedient, that by the mercy bestowed on you they may also themselves obtain mercy.*”

The former disobedience of the Gentiles (i. 18 ff.) ought to repress all uncharitable feelings in regard to the present disobedience of the Jews, more especially as their disobedience has been made the occasion of God's mercy to the Gentiles.

The Apostle describes in v. 30 the *past* and *present* relations of Gentile and Jew, and compares them in v. 31 with their *present* and *future* relations.

The comparison involves also a difference, for while in each case “*disobedience*” is overcome by “*mercy*” there is a direct contrast in the means employed: “*mercy*” to the Gentiles results from “*disobedience*” in the Jews, “*mercy*” to the Jews is to be the result of “*mercy*” already bestowed upon the Gentiles: compare xv. 9. The order of the words in the Greek (for which compare 2 Cor. xii. 7) admits, but does not require, a different construction of v. 31: “*Even so have these also now been disobedient, because of the mercy bestowed on you.*” But the parallel clauses are in this way less perfectly balanced than in the order of A V. retained above.

Or,  
obeyed.

1 Or, shut  
them all  
up to-  
gether.

not believed, that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy.

32 For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all.

33 O the depth of the riches both

of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!

34 For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor?

<sup>a</sup> Is. 40. 23.  
Wis. 9.  
<sup>b</sup> 1 Cor. 2. 16.

**32. For God hath concluded them all in unbelief.**] Rather, "For God shut them all up to disobedience." The final proof that God will have mercy on Israel is that this is in accordance with and part of the universal plan of His salvation. By "them all" the Apostle denotes all of whom he has been speaking, i.e. both Jews and Gentiles in the same natural and unexaggerated sense in which he spoke of "all Israel" in v. 26. Doctrinal motives for unduly limiting or extending the application are excluded by the consideration "that the universality of the Divine purpose of redemption (comp. 1 Tim. ii. 4), and the sufficiency of the redemption actually wrought for the justification of all (v. 18), do not exclude its partial non-realisation at last through the fault of the individuals concerned" (Meyer).

The meaning of the phrase "concluded" or "shut up to disobedience" is best seen in the passages where the Septuagint has the same Greek verb: Ps. xxxi. 8, "And hast not shut me up into the hand of the enemy," Ps. lxxviii. 50, "but gave their life (LXX, 'cattle') over to the pestilence." Ib. v. 62, "He gave his people over also unto the sword."

In accordance with these passages, and with St. Paul's own usage (Gal. iii. 22), God is represented as giving over all men, both Jews and Gentiles, to disobedience, without power of escape: a bold and striking declaration of God's all-ruling Providence, forcing even sin into the service of His mercy.

There are various modes of softening the expression: e.g. that of Chrysostom and other Greek Fathers, that God convicted them all of disobedience; and that of Diodorus in the Catena, that God did not cause the disobedience, but only permitted it through the exercise of man's free will. But St. Paul's language means more than this: God's Providence places man in such circumstances that the perversity of his will shows itself in actual disobedience. This has been fully proved in regard to the Heathen in i. 24, 26, 28, and in regard to those who were under the law in ch. ii. and ch. vii. "We ought to add that in both cases the latent sin had manifested itself freely and actively, before taking the form of a judgment from God" (Godet).

Instead therefore of trying to weaken the real force of the Apostle's language, it is far better to fix our thoughts on the glorious

vindication of God's severity which is shown in the gracious purpose that it is intended to serve.

that he might have mercy upon all.] Rather, "upon them all," meaning, as in the former clause, the definite whole (*τοὺς πάντας*) made up of "the fulness of the Gentiles" and "all Israel;" see note at the end. To "have mercy" means to make them partakers of that "common salvation" (Jude 3), which is emphatically a dispensation of mercy, as is shown in vv. 30, 31.

"God by His ineffable wisdom so disposes and controls the affairs of men, that there is no part of mankind that is not involved in sin; not that He is the cause of sin in any, but that for a time He suffers men to fall by their own sinfulness, in order that when they have discovered their error they may feel that they have been saved, not by their own merit, but by the free mercy of God, that they may not grow arrogant. And in the meantime, while doing this, He is so far from suggesting evil to any one, that by His goodness He marvellously turns the evils of others to our good. But perhaps we are entering too deep into the recesses of this mystery, for a man speaking to men.

"Amazement comes over me as I contemplate the ineffable method of God's counsel; and since I cannot explain it, I would fain exclaim, O the depth of His superabounding wisdom!" (Erasmus.)

33-36. The glorious truth declared in v. 32 forces from the Apostle's heart an exclamation of adoring wonder, which forms a noble conclusion to the great argument of the Epistle. The wrath "revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness" (i. 18), has given place to the mercy which embraces all the nations of the earth.

33. *O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God!*] Rather, "*O the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God.*" This construction, adopted by Origen, Chrysostom, and other Greek Fathers, is commended by its greater simplicity, and by the fact that, after quoting, in v. 34, a passage from Isaiah (xl. 13) which illustrates God's wisdom and knowledge, St. Paul adds, in v. 35, a passage from Job (xli. 11) which refers to the riches of God.

"Depth" is frequently found in the Greek classics as an attribute of "riches" (Soph.

35 Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again?

'Ajax,' 130), and also of "wisdom" and "knowledge" (Aeschylus, 'Sept. c. Theb.' 578; Pindar, 'Nem.', iv. 7; Plato, 'Theat.' p. 183, E.). As applied to the latter words here, it denotes not "unfathomable mystery," but only "inexhaustible fulness."

The true distinction between "knowledge" and "wisdom" is briefly indicated by Theodoret: "He foreknew these things from the beginning, and having foreknown them, He arranged (*φρονόμησε*) them wisely." Bp. Lightfoot remarks on Col. ii. 3: "While *γνῶστις* is simply *intuitive*, *σοφία* is *ratiocinative* also. While *γνῶστις* applies chiefly to the apprehension of truths, *σοφία* superadds the power of reasoning about them and tracing their relations." To complete the distinction, we must add that while "knowledge" is *theoretical*, "wisdom" is *practical*, and while "knowledge" is purely *intellectual*, "wisdom" is also *moral*, and for that reason is both the most perfect of mental gifts (Aristotle, 'Nic. Eth.' vi. 10) and the queen of all virtues (Cicero, 'de Off. i. 43). In the present context *γνῶστις* seems to refer especially to God's foreknowledge of the free determinations of man's will, both in individuals and in nations: while *σοφία* denotes the admirable skill with which He includes man's free actions in His plan, and transforms them into so many means for the accomplishment of His good purpose (Godet).

*how unsearchable are his judgments,*] According to Meyer God's "judgments" are the determinate purposes which His "wisdom" sets before Him, and for the attainment of which His "power" is exerted. "His ways" are the particular courses which His "knowledge" discerns to be the best in which His "power" can work.

Tholuck reverses this view: the "judgments" are the decisions of the Divine knowledge, and the "ways" are the methods which God's wisdom adopts for realising those decisions.

It seems simpler and truer to say that knowledge and wisdom are combined both in forming the judgments, and choosing the ways to accomplish them.

To man's natural reason these "judgments" of God are unsearchable as the great deep (Ps. xxxvi. 6; compare Job xi. 7), and "His ways past finding out" (Job ix. 10; compare Eccles. viii. 16, 17: "because though a man labour to seek it out, yet he shall not find it; yea farther; though a wise man think to know it, yet shall he not be able to find it.")

In the contemplation of "judgments" and

36 For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen.

"ways," which thus pass man's understanding, the Apostle is forced to exclaim, "*O the depth of . . . the wisdom and knowledge of God!*"

St. Augustine often uses this passage as if it were equivalent to ix. 20, "*Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?*" He thus silences all objection to his own predestination doctrines, such as that of the damnation of infants dying unbaptized: Serm. 294, § 7: compare Serm. 15, § 3, and 27, § 7. But this passage is not a denunciation of presumptuous objections against the wisdom and goodness of God's *hidden ways*: it is an outburst of wonder and delight in contemplating a glorious *revelation* of wisdom and goodness surpassing all that the heart of man could have conceived.

34, 35. St. Paul now justifies the wondering exclamations of v. 33 by passages of the Old Testament which illustrate the knowledge and wisdom and riches of God, the order of the three ideas in v. 33 being here inverted, as is very usual, so as to bring the last thought into immediate connexion with its own illustration.

34. *who hath known the mind of the Lord?*] The A.V.—"Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord"—is closer to the Hebrew. See note on Is. xl. 13. But the Septuagint, which St. Paul follows, sufficiently preserves the general thought that the Divine intelligence is incomprehensible and immeasurable to man. See 1 Cor. ii. 16, and compare Judith viii. 13, 14; Wisdom, ix. 17.

"O the depth of the knowledge of God!" For who can measure the mind (*νοῦν*) which is the organ of that knowledge (*γνώσεως*).

*or who hath been his counsellor?*] Is not His wisdom all His own, admitting no aid nor counsel from beings of inferior faculties?

35. *Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again?*] See note on Job xli. 11. The Septuagint is here quite erroneous, and St. Paul setting it aside gives the sense of the Hebrew correctly but freely: "*Or who hath first given to him, and shall be repaid again?*" Herein is shown "*the depth of the riches of God*," that no gift of His is a requital of benefits first conferred on Him, but all are of His own free grace and overflowing bounty. The Apostle here once more touches the root of Jewish error, the self-righteous notion of earning God's favour by previous merit.

36. The reason why none can make God his debtor is that all things are "*from*

**him**" as their first cause (1 Cor. viii. 6) and "*through him*" as the ever present agent who still "*worketh all in all*" (1 Cor. xii. 6; Heb. ii. 10), and "*unto him*," as their final cause in whom all reach the end and perfection of their being.

Of these three clauses the first and second might be referred to the Father and the Son respectively, but the third "*unto him*" cannot possibly refer to the Spirit as a distinct Person. We must understand all three of God the Father, or rather of the whole God-head, as in v. 33.

The Doxology then follows as a noble

conclusion to St. Paul's great argument; it stands in simple grandeur, like one of the Patriarch's pillars (Gen. xxviii. 18; xxxv. 11) set up in remembrance of some special revelation of the goodness and majesty of God.

*to whom, &c.] "To him be the glory for ever. Amen."*

"As the rivers return again to the place whence they came, they all come from the sea, and they all run into the sea again: so all our store as it issued at first from the fountain of His grace, so should it fall at last into the ocean of His glory" (Bp. Sanderson, Serm. on Rom. xv. 6).

#### ADDITIONAL NOTES on vv. 7, 9, 12, 13, 32.

**7. ἐπωρώθησαν.** The Verb is used only once in the LXX, Job xvii. 7, *πεπόρωται οἱ ὄφθαλμοὶ μου*, where the Hebrew is בְּנֵי חַדָּה "to be feeble" or "dim," as a lamp.

The real root *πώρος* was the name of a stone used for statuary (Ammonius, Valckn. Animadv. p. 169). It was also applied to "callus": Aristot. Hist. Anim. III. xix. 9, Σηπόμενον δὲ γίνεται τὸ αἷμα εἰς τῷ σώματι πύνη, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ πυνή πώρος. Hence *πωρώ* and *πώρωσις* were used by medical writers, e.g. Dioscorides, to describe the formation of callus in the re-union of broken bones; see Liddell and Scott. The Adjective *πωρός* appears to be an invention of the grammarians (Fritzsche).

**9.** The Hebrew means literally: "Be their table before them for a snare, and to them at ease for a trap."

The LXX render Γενθήτω ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν ἔωπτον αὐτῶν εἰς παγίδα καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδοσιν καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον.

St. Paul, quoting freely from memory, for ἔωπτον αὐτῶν puts αὐτοῖς at the end, inserts καὶ εἰς θήραν, and changes the order of the two last clauses, reading καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδοσα αὐτοῖς.

**12. ἥττημα.** The word is found once in the LXX, Is. xxxi. 8, οἱ δὲ νεανικοὶ ἕστοτε εἰς ἥττημα, and in 1 Cor. vi. 7, ὅλως ἥττημα. In Isaiah the Heb. סִלְלָה is rendered by Fürst, Ewald, Delitzsch, Gesenius, &c., "for tribute," which is its usual meaning: the LXX (followed by A. V. *discomfited*), render it in this one passage as if it were derived from סִלְלָה "to melt away;" though this interpretation may be incorrect, the sense in which they used ἥττημα is obviously that of *the loss and diminution which an army sustains by defeat*.

That St. Paul here uses the word (*ἥττημα*) as meaning "diminution," is clear from the antithesis to *πλήρωμα*, which means the "complement," or full number. See Bp. Lightfoot,

*Colossians*, p. 323, who shows that in this passage *πλήρωμα* has its usual meaning 'the full number,' 'the whole body' (whether the whole absolutely, or the whole relatively to God's purpose), of whom only a part had been hitherto gathered into the Church.

**13. γάρ DFGL 17, 37 Vul., Goth., Pp. gr. et lat.**

δέ A B N P 47, Cop., Syr. utr., Memph., Arm., Theodoret (some MSS.), Damasc., Lachm., Tisch. 8, Meyer, who remarks, "With such divided testimony, δέ is the best supported, and to be preferred; it came to be glossed by more definite particles."

Ib. μὲν οὖν Lachm., Tisch. and (doubtfully) Tregelles, with preponderance of external authority.

**32. τοὺς πάντας.** This expression has, of course, the same meaning and extent in both clauses. Meyer supposes it to denote all Jews and Gentiles not only "in the gross" but "*jointly and severally*," so as to include "each single member of the collective whole." This however is precisely what would have been expressed by *πάντας*, without the Article: whereas *τοὺς πάντας* is used "with pointed reference to *the whole viewed in the mass*" (Rev. T. S. Green, 'Grammar of New Testament Dialect,' iv. § 4).

Some interpret the passage of *the final salvation of all men*: but in accordance with the meaning of "mercy" in vv. 30, 31, to "have mercy upon them all" can only mean to bring them all, Jews as well as Gentiles, into the Church of Christ on earth: "One thing only St. Paul here teaches: it is that at the close of the history of mankind upon this earth there will be an economy of grace in which salvation shall be extended to all the nations living here below, and that this magnificent result will be the effect of the humbling dispensations through which the two portions of humanity, Jews and Gentiles, shall successively have passed" (Godet).

## CHAPTER XII.

**I** God's mercies must move us to please God.  
**3** No man must think too well of himself, 6  
 but attend every one on that calling wherein  
 he is placed. 9 Love, and many other duties,

are required of us. 19 Revenge is specially  
 forbidden.

**I** BESEECH you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God,  
 that ye present your bodies a living

## CHAP. XII.—HOLY LIVING.

St. Paul now passes from the main argument of the Epistle to practical exhortations based upon the preceding doctrines.

Melancthon thought that in the following chapters Christian duties are classified in a formal scheme, as *moral* (xii.), *political* (xiii.), and *ecclesiastical* (xiv.-xv. 12).

But the Apostle's thoughts seem rather to flow on in a natural order, of which the general course can easily be traced. He begins by requiring personal consecration to God's service (xii. 1, 2), and from this inmost centre of the spiritual life he follows out its manifold development in Christian graces (xii. 3-21) and civil duties (xiii. 1-10), enforcing his exhortations by the prospect of the coming day of the Lord (xiii. 11-14).

"It will be observed how comprehensively he surveys the whole range of human action and conduct. He starts from the consideration of men as constituting 'many members in one body,' and he proceeds to direct them in their various offices. He passes in review the private and public duties to which they might be called—ministering, teaching, exhorting, giving, ruling and obeying; he depicts the spirit of the Christian in business and in rest, in joy and in sorrow, in hope and in tribulation, towards friends and towards enemies, in peace and in wrath: and he lays down the Christian principles of civil government and civil obedience. It is a picture of life in its length and breadth, and even in all its lights and shadows, transfigured, as the landscape by the sun, under the renovating influence of those spiritual rays of love which illuminated and warmed the Apostle's soul" (Vace, 'Christianity and Morality,' p. 147).

**1, 2. THE LIVING SACRIFICE.** The Apostle begins with tender entreaty, and in the fulness of divine grace just unfolded finds the strongest motive by which he can "beseech" his "brethren" to consecrate both body (*v. 1*) and mind (*v. 2*) to a holy obedience: compare 2 Cor. x. i.

The word "*therefore*" connects this chapter immediately with the last, as in Eph. iv. 1, where the course of thought and mode of transition are very similar. But it is equally true that the Apostle bases his exhortation to holiness upon the doctrines of grace set forth at large in the whole preceding argument of the Epistle, which culminates in the

declaration of God's all-embracing mercy in xi. 32.

*by the mercies of God.*] The mercy (*θεός*) so often spoken of in ch. xi., as embracing both Jew and Gentile in a common salvation, is here described by a stronger word in the plural number, expressing the tenderest compassion as shown in manifold forms (*οἰκτυμῶν*), a word very frequent in the LXX (2 Sam. xxiv. 11; Ps. li. 1; Neh. ix. 19, 27, 28, 31).

*present]* *παραστῆσαι*, a proper term for bringing an offering to the Lord (Lev. vi. 7; Luke ii. 22; Col. i. 22, 28).

*your bodies]* The body is claimed first for God's service, because there was great need to warn new converts from heathenism against sins of the flesh: compare 1 Thess. iv. 3. That the Roman Christians had need of such exhortation, is clear from vi. 12, 13, 19.

*a living sacrifice,*] The sanctification of the outward part of man, which is a true sacrifice, is beautifully represented under the symbols of sacrificial worship. The language is most appropriate; for the sincere worshipper, whether Gentile or Jew, saw in the sacrifice which he presented on the altar a symbol of his own self-devotion. This symbolic purpose determined the choice of the proper material for an altar-sacrifice: it must represent the offerer's *life*.

For this reason, in all the chief sacrifices it must be itself a *living* creature: and in every case, without exception, it must be the offerer's own lawful property, the fruit of his *life work*, and also fit, as food, for the *support of his life*. In presenting such a sacrifice the worshipper was presenting *a portion of his own life* as a symbol of the whole. Compare Kurtz, 'Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament,' p. 60, &c.

This idea of the devotion of the offerer's life was most strikingly embodied in the continual Burnt-offering (Ex. xxix. 38-42; Num. xxviii. 3), the flesh of which was all given over to the sacred fire of the altar, and thence ascended in its purified essence as a sweet-smelling savour to Jehovah: so must the Christian offer his body to the inward refining fire of the Holy Ghost, that it may be made a sacrifice acceptable to God (Kurtz, p. 162).

But how "*a living sacrifice*"? The sanctified body might be called "*a living sacrifice*,"

sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service.

2 And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by

the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.

because its natural life is not consumed in the offering like that of an ordinary sacrifice. But that St. Paul has a deeper meaning is proved by the parallel passage, vi. 13, "present (*παρατίθεσθε*, A.V. 'yield') yourselves unto God as alive from the dead." There is in every sacrifice a death, and in this sacrifice a death unto sin, out of which there arises a new life of righteousness unto God. Thus the "*living sacrifice*" is that in which, though the natural life is not lost, a new life of holiness is gained: compare vi. 13.

The fire of this offering, as Chrysostom says, "needs no wood or fuel laid beneath, but lives of itself, and does not burn up the sacrifice, but rather gives it life."

This consecration of the body is preparatory to its final redemption.

*acceptable unto God,*] Literally, "well pleasing to God": compare Wisdom iv. 10; Phil. iv. 18; Col. iii. 20.

*which is your reasonable service.*] An apposition to the sentence "*present your bodies a living sacrifice*."

The sanctification of the body, though in the truest sense a sacrifice, is not, like the symbolical sacrifice, an outward act of religious worship (*λατρεία*): the self-dedication is an act of the mind or reason (*λόγος*), and in this sense "*a reasonable service*."

St. Paul thus teaches his readers, who might miss the external pomp of Pagan or Jewish sacrificial worship, that they had gained something far better by becoming Christians. "*Your worship*," he means, "is of a higher order, the worship of your reason: each of you for himself can now present a sacrifice in the highest sense "holy, acceptable to God"; each can be himself a priest serving God with a spiritual worship.

In 'The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs,' p. 547, the angels are said to offer "an unbloody and reasonable (*λαογικόν*) offering."

2. Sanctification must extend to man's whole nature, and include both separation from all that is unholy, and an inward change in the man himself.

*be not conformed to this world:*] Or, "fashion not yourselves like unto this world" (Tyndale).

The Jews distinguished the times before and after the expected coming of their Messiah as "*this world* (*aiών*, age)," and "*the world to come*."

Our Lord Himself and His disciples

applied the same names to the times before and after his Second Advent, including the persons and the general state of things proper to "*this world*" and "*the world to come*." "*The prince of this world*" is Satan, and "*the children of this world*" are the wicked: "*to deliver us from this present wicked world*" (Gal. i. 4) was the purpose of Christ's death. The Christian therefore must not in his daily life (mark the Present Tenses) be of the same fashion *συνχρηματίζεσθε* with "*this world*," as he was formerly when living "*after the flesh*" (viii. 12); but on the contrary he must be undergoing a thorough transformation (*μεταμορφώσθε*) by the renewing of his mind, which ceases to be "*the mind of the flesh*" (Col. ii. 18), and under the influence of the Holy Ghost (Tit. iii. 5) is renewed day by day (2 Cor. iv. 16) "*unto knowledge*" (Col. iii. 10).

This work of God's Spirit does not exclude the co-operation of man's will, which is presupposed in the exhortation "*be ye transformed*." On the difference between *σχῆμα*, the fleeting figure or *fashion*, and *μορφή*, the essential organic *form*, see notes on ii. 20, 1 Pet. i. 14, and 1 Cor. vii. 31 ("*the fashion of this world passeth away*"), and Bp. Lightfoot's Dissertation on Phil. ii. 6, 7.

*that ye may prove]* The unrenewed mind cannot "*prove what is the will of God*," i.e. assay (*δικιάζειν*) or discern by practical experience what God wills (Eph. v. 10): to do this is the end for which St. Paul would have his readers transformed by the renewal of the mind.

*that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God,*] Read, *the good, &c.* It has been proposed to render the passage as follows: "*the will of God, namely that which is good, and well pleasing, and perfect.*" But this construction is, at least, uncommon in the N. T.

The objections urged against the A. V. are

(1) That the expression "*acceptable will of God*" is unintelligible, (2) that it is mere tautology.

(1) What, it is asked, is the meaning of "*acceptable*" as applied to "*the will*"? To whom is the will acceptable?

The answer is that "*the will*" (*τὸ θέλημα*) means not the faculty, as the objection implies, but its object, what God wills: and this object is "*acceptable*" or well-pleasing (*εὐάπειρος*) to God who wills it. There is

<sup>¶ Gr. to  
soberly.</sup> 3 For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith.

4 For as we have many members

in one body, and all members have not the same office:

5 So we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another.

6 Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us pro-

an evident reference to the words in v. 1, “*a sacrifice acceptable unto God.*” The same word (*εὐάρτερον*) is used in Wisdom ix. 10 (“*that I may know what is pleasing unto thee.*”).

(2) It would be tautology to state as a general abstract proposition that what God wills is acceptable or well-pleasing to Him: but St. Paul is speaking of a particular object of God’s will, the sanctification of His people (1 Thess. iv. 3); and this the Apostle describes, with an emphatic accumulation and climax of epithets as “good, and acceptable, and perfect.”

### 3-21. CHRISTIAN GRACES.

The general idea of consecration to God’s service is now carried out into particular duties, beginning with the right exercise of special gifts in the Church (vv. 3-8): the first place is here given to humility or sober-mindedness as essential to Christian unity.

3. *For I say, through the grace given unto me,*] The close connexion with vv. 1, 2, indicated in the word “*for,*” lies in the thought that humility is the immediate effect of self-surrender to God.

St. Paul speaks with authority through the grace given unto him, to make him the Apostle of the Gentiles (i. 5).

*to every man that is among you.*] The sense of these emphatic words must be sought in the context, which shows that the Apostle’s precept is expressly meant to include, in its universality, those whose special spiritual gifts had gained for them influence or office in the Church at Rome (compare v. 6). St. Paul, it seems, either knew that there had been, or feared that there might be the same spiritual presumption at Rome as at Corinth, whence he was writing.

*not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think;*] The play on words in the Greek has a force which can hardly be imitated: “*not to be high minded above a right mind, but to be of a mind to be sober minded, according as God hath dealt to each a measure of faith.*”

The last clause fixes the standard by which a man who has “*a mind to be sober*

*minded*” must judge of himself. We learn from it that faith is a gift of God, given in different measures, according to the capacity of each man’s nature and the work to which God calls him, and that, as the receptive faculty, faith regulates and measures all the powers of the spiritual man. “In proportion as the faith of individuals is more or less living, practical, active, operative in this or that direction, contemplative, or entering into outward life in oratory, action, and so forth, they have to measure accordingly the position and task that befit them in the Church” (Meyer). The emphatic position of *ἐκάρτως*, gives prominence to the idea of diversity between one man and another: 1 Cor. iii. 5; vii. 17.

4, 5. *For as we have many members in one body, &c.*] Translate: “*For just as in one body we have many members, and the members have not all the same office: So are we the many one body in Christ, and severally members one of another.*”

The reason why each must judge of himself according to the measure of faith dealt to him by God, is that the Church, like our own body, consists of many members having different functions to perform.

As the many members are one body in the man, so the multitude of believers “*are one body in Christ.*” Thus Christ is here presented not as the head to which the other members are subject (as in Eph. i. 22; iv. 15, &c.), but as the living Person uniting and animating the whole body: compare 1 Cor. xii. 12.

From this unity of the whole follows the mutual dependence of the parts: belonging all to one body, they severally belong one to another. This thought, not expressed in v. 4, is added in the application of the figure, to enforce the duty of believers to work together, each in his proper sphere, for the common welfare of the Church. Compare Eph. iv. 25.

6-8. The thought that “*the members have not all the same office*” is now applied in detail to the Church.

The construction of the sentence is a little obscured by extreme brevity, but the meaning is rightly brought out in the A. V.

*phesy according to the proportion of faith;*

7 Or ministry, let us wait on our ministering: or he that teacheth, on teaching;

The “*gifts*” (cf. v. 15) vary as the grace of God, of which they are effects, is manifold (1 Pet. iv. 10). They are special qualities and powers imparted by the One Spirit, who also directs the diversity of their operations to one end. “Most frequently it is a natural talent that the Spirit of God appropriates, increasing its power and sanctifying its use” (Gode).

The first four gifts here named are connected with special offices.

Prophecy in the Christian Church was a gift whereby the mind, enlightened and exalted by the Spirit of revelation, was able to declare the purposes of God, and to foretell future events (Acts xi. 28; xx. 23; xxi. 4, 11), as well as to unfold the deep mysteries of the Christian faith, and clothe its moral precepts in words of wisdom and power not of man’s teaching. The prophets were esteemed next in dignity to the Apostles. (1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iii. 5; iv. 11.)

St. Paul prescribes that the prophets should exercise their gift “according to the proportion of their faith;” these words evidently refer to v. 3, and mean that the prophets should utter neither more nor less than the revelation received by their *measure of faith*, without exaggeration, display, or self-seeking.

“The rule of faith,” “the general analogy of revealed truth,” and all similar renderings which make “*faith*” mean that which is to be believed, are unsuited to the context and otherwise untenable.

7. *ministry,*] The word *diakonia*, meaning “active service,” has wide and varied applications. It often includes all ministration or office in the Christian Church (Acts i. 17, 25; xx. 24; xxi. 19; Rom. xi. 13; 2 Cor. iii. 8, 9; iv. 1; v. 18; vi. 3; xi. 8; Eph. iv. 12; 1 Tim. i. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 3, 11). But as “*there are differences of administrations*” (1 Cor. xii. 5) the word is also applied in more limited senses, as for example, to “the ministration of the word” (Acts vi. 4), and very frequently to the ministration of alms (Acts vi. 1; xi. 29; xii. 25; Rom. xv. 31; 1 Cor. xvi. 15; 2 Cor. viii. 4; ix. 1, 12, 13).

Since in this passage St. Paul is speaking of various special gifts, and distinguishes “*ministry*” from prophecy, teaching, and exhortation, the word must be taken in a limited sense, as service in things temporal and external, such as the wants of the poor, the sick, and the stranger.

8 Or he that exhorteth, on exhortation: he that *giveth, let him do it*<sup>1Or, im-</sup>  
<sup>parteth.</sup>  
<sup>1Or, liberally.</sup> with simplicity; he that ruleth,  
with diligence; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness.

As in Acts vi, men “full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom” are to be set over “the daily ministration” of alms, so here “ministry” or “diaconate” is a “*gift*.”

Compare 1 Tim. iii. 8, 12, and 1 Pet. iv. 11, which latter passage is very like this in sense and construction.

let us wait on our ministering:] This is a fair paraphrase and completion of the sense; the words in the Greek are simply “in the ministry,” meaning ‘Let us keep within our proper ministry, and be wholly occupied therein.’ Comp. 1 Tim. iv. 15, “give thyself wholly to them” (*ἐν τοῖς ταθί*).

or be that teacheth,] The teacher’s gift lies in an enlightened understanding and a faculty of clear exposition: he uses “the word of wisdom” or “the word of knowledge” to arrange, develop, and enforce truths previously revealed. In 1 Cor. xii. 28, he is ranked next after apostles and prophets.

8. or be that exhorteth,] “Teaching addresses itself to the understanding, exhortation to the heart and will” (Philippi). “Exhortation” was especially used in the early Church as in the Synagogue (Luke iv. 20; Acts xiii. 15; Justin Martyr ‘Apol.’ i. c. 87) to impress the lessons of Scripture upon the conscience, will, and affections.

The possessor of this, or either of the preceding gifts, is bidden to occupy himself in the province thus marked out for him, and be content therewith.

be that giveth, let him do it with simplicity:] From gifts that qualify for special offices in the Church St. Paul passes to others of a more general nature.

The first, almsgiving (Eph. iv. 28; 1 Tim. vi. 18), is to be practised “in simplicity” or singleness of heart, without ostentation or any selfish aim (Eph. vi. 5; Col. iii. 22).

“Liberality,” though not expressed in the word (*ἀπλότητι*), is essentially connected with this single-mindedness. It need not seem strange that a gift of the Spirit is required for the right use of riches, if we remember our Lord’s teaching (Matt. vi. 3; xix. 21).

be that ruleth,] Literally, “he that presideth” (*ὁ προΐσταμενος*). A similar title (*ὁ προεστώς*) is used by Justin Martyr, ‘Apologia’ I. 65, 67, to denote the minister who presided at the celebration of the Eucharist. In the N. T. this special use does not occur, but the word denotes those who

9 Let love be without dissimulation. Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good.

10 Be kindly affectioned one to another "with brotherly love; in honour preferring one another;

11 Not slothful in business; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord;

For, in  
the love  
of the  
brethren.

were set in authority over a Church (1 Thess. v. 12), the presbyters (1 Tim. v. 17.) Their special qualification was probably the gift of government (*κυβερνήσεις*, 1 Cor. xii. 28), their duties being such as the restraint of disorder, correction of abuses, and enforcement of discipline. In a still more general sense the word is applied to ruling one's own house and children (1 Tim. iii. 4, 5, 12), and to directing the practice of good works (Tit. iii. 8, 14). This last meaning seems best suited to the present context, in which the work described as 'ruling' stands between almsgiving and showing mercy.

"Diligence," or earnestness in business (*σπουδή*), would be a quality especially needed in the superintendence of works of benevolence.

*be that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness.]* Whether he is consoling the mourner, or relieving the sufferer, let him feel and shew that the service is willingly and gladly rendered.

9-21. From the right use of special gifts, St. Paul passes on to enjoin principles and habits which are required in all members of Christ's body.

"Love" comes first, both as forming a natural transition from the thoughts in v. 8, and as the common element of the virtues which follow.

9. *Let love be without dissimulation.]* Render, *Let love be unfeigned.* Compare 2 Cor. vi. 6; 1 Pet. i. 22. "Dissimulation," introduced by Tyndale, is a much less happy rendering than either "feigning" (Wyclif), or "simulation" (Rheims).

In grammatical construction this and the following clauses to v. 13 are elliptical and unconnected; but their hortatory sense is evident, and in some cases their order suggests a connexion of thought, which is correctly marked by the division of verses.

Thus "love" can be genuine only in those who "abhor that which is evil," and "cleave to that which is good."

10. Again, between members of the one family in Christ love takes a special form, and should be marked by a tender affection like that of near relatives (*φιλόστοργος*):

12 Rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation; continuing instant in prayer;

13 Distributing to the necessity of saints; given to hospitality.

14 Bless them which persecute you: bless, and curse not.

15 Rejoice with them that do re-

*"In brotherly-love be affectionate one to another."* The emphatic order of the Greek is lost in the A. V.

*[preferring one another.]* As brethren be more forward to pay respect than to receive it, "*in honour preventing one another*" (Douay Version), or "*leading the way one for another, not in claiming but in showing respect.*"

11. *Not slothful in business;*] The whole passage refers to Christian duties as such, and would be better rendered, "*in zeal not flagging, in spirit fervent* (Acts xviii. 25), *serving the Lord.*"

There is a close connexion of thought in the three clauses: active zeal must be sustained by fervour of spirit, and both devoted to the service of Christ: compare Col. iii. 24.

The other reading, "*serving the time,*" has very little support from the MSS, and gives a less suitable sense, whether taken as equivalent to "*redeeming the time*" (Eph. v. 16), or as a caution that zeal and fervour must be moderated by opportunity. (Ambrosiaster.)

12. In this verse also the three clauses are connected in thought: joy and patience both grow out of perseverance in prayer.

The "*hope*" which St. Paul sets against tribulation here, as in v. 2, 3, is the definite Christian hope, "*the hope of the glory of God.*"

13. *Distributing]* "*Communicating*" (Douay). The Greek word means, "to be, or act as, a partner;" either by partaking (xv. 27; 1 Pet. iv. 13; 1 Tim. v. 22), or by communicating, as here and in Gal. vi. 6.

The variation (*μνήσις*), "*partaking in the commemoration of the saints,*" is an acknowledged corruption, derived from a custom unknown to the Apostolic age.

"*The saints*" are simply Christians as such (ch. i. 7): if in want, let them be relieved by their brethren; if on a journey, let them be received with hospitality. The two duties here and elsewhere enjoined by St. Paul were of special importance in the circumstances of the early churches (1 Tim. v. 10; Tit. i. 8).

*given to hospitality.]* Literally, *pursuing hospitality*, i.e. not waiting for the claim to be made, but eagerly seeking opportunities (compare ix. 30, 31; xiv. 19).

joyce, and weep with them that weep.

<sup>1 Or, be contented with mean things.</sup> **16** Be of the same mind one toward another. Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate. Be not wise in your own conceits.

**17** Recompense to no man evil for

evil. Provide things honest in the sight of all men.

**18** If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men.

**19** Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath : for it is written, <sup>a</sup>Vengeance <sub>35.</sub>

**14.** The expression, “*pursuing hospitality*,” v. 13, suggests the other sense of the same word, “*persecute*.” The Apostle is thus led to anticipate the thought which he develops fully in vv. 17–21, that it is a Christian’s duty to love his enemies, and overcome evil with good.

This precept is certainly derived from the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 44; Luke vi. 28), and proves that St. Paul, though he had not seen our present written Gospels, must have known the substance of Our Lord’s teaching.

**15.** The same sentiment is expressed in the Talmud: “Let not any rejoice among them that weep, nor weep among them that rejoice.” Compare Ecclesiasticus vii. 34.

Chrysostom finely observes that it is natural to sympathise with sorrow, but that it requires a noble soul to rejoice in others’ joy.

**16.** The two precepts of v. 15 are combined in the wider principle, “*Be of the same mind one toward another*:” i.e. let each so enter into the feelings and desires of the other as to be of one mind with him.

This loving concord cannot exist, where the mind is set on “*high things*,” such as rank, wealth, honour. (Compare Phil. iii. 19; 1 Tim. vi. 17.)

*descend to men of low estate.*] Literally, “Let yourselves be drawn along with, i.e. yield yourselves up to, the lowly.”

Compare Gal. ii. 13; 2 Pet. iii. 17, where the unfavourable sense belongs not to the expression “*drawn away with*,” but to the context.

The adjective *ταπεινώς* is used in the N. T. frequently of persons, never of things. It is better therefore to follow the same usage here, and understand it of lowly persons as in A. V.

A want of sympathy with the “*lowly*” bars man from man and class from class, so that they cannot “*be of the same mind one toward another*.”

Another chief hindrance to concord is marked in the warning, “*Be not wise in your own conceits*” (Prov. iii. 7, and c. xi. 25).

**17–21.** From the mutual duties of brethren in Christ, St. Paul passes to the wider relations of the Christian towards all men, and especially towards his enemies.

Enmity being the world’s prevailing attitude, how must the Christian meet it?

**17.** The precept, “*render to no man evil for evil*,” is derived from the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 38–48), and stands in noble contrast to the “lex talionis” of Pharisaic and Heathen morality.

The warm friend and bitter foe was undoubtedly the ideal hero of ancient Heathendom (see Pindar, Pyth. ii. 155; Isthm. iii. 81); yet even here a God of love left Himself not without witness, and it is a part of Christian piety to recognise the pure and elevated teaching of a Socrates, and to love the example of his forbearing and forgiving patience. See the interesting passage in Plato’s ‘Republic,’ I. p. 335, where Socrates discusses the maxim “Do good to thy friend, and harm to thine enemy,” and ascribes it to one of the Tyrants, or the Wise Men, of Greece.

*Provide things honest.*] Again, to disarm enmity, use such forethought that your conduct may not only be blameless in the sight of God, who reads the heart, but may also be “*honourable in the sight of all men*,” through its transparent goodness and justice.

Here, and in 2 Cor. viii. 21, St. Paul follows the Septuagint Version of Proverbs iii. 4, which differs from the Hebrew and A.V.

The meaning is not that the Christian should seek the praise of men for himself, but that he should give no cause of suspicion or offence: a precept of the truest practical wisdom.

**18.** Peace is a mutual relation which may be broken on either side: accordingly the duty of living peaceably with all men is absolute, so far as it depends on ourselves, conditional so far as its possibility depends on others.

St. Paul unites the two aspects in a single sentence, which may be thus paraphrased:

“Live peaceably with all men, if through their conduct it be possible: at all events, as far as it depends on you, live peaceably with all men.”

**19.** *Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath:]* “*Avenge not yourselves, beloved, but give place to God’s wrath.*” Literally, “to the wrath:”

*is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.*

<sup>b</sup> Prov. 25. <sup>21.</sup> 20 <sup>b</sup> Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give

him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head.

21 Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.

the reference of the Article to “**God’s wrath**” is made certain by the quotation which follows: compare v. 9, 1 Thess. ii. 16; and Ecclesiasticus xix. 17, xxxviii. 12; Prov. xx. 22, xxiv. 29. Both the language and the thought are illustrated by Eph. iv. 27, which shows that by avenging ourselves we *give place to the devil*.

*Vengeance is mine;] To Me belongeth vengeance,* Deut. xxxii. 35. The exact order and literal meaning of the Hebrew are preserved in the Greek here and in Heb. x. 30, though both were lost in the Septuagint Version, *ινέμετα ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδώσων*.

It is further remarkable that in the latter part of the quotation St. Paul himself does not adhere literally to the Heb., “*and recompence*” (A. V. Deut.), but follows partly the LXX and partly the paraphrase adopted in the so-called Targum of Onkelos, “I will repay,” and himself adds the words, “*said the Lord.*” (Fritzsche.)

It is thus evident that the Apostle’s purpose throughout the verse is to put in the strongest light of emphasis and contrast (“*not yourselves*”—“*I*”) the truth that vengeance is not for us but for God. This meaning is quite lost, when the words “*give place to wrath*” are made equivalent to “*resist not the wrath of your adversary*,” or “*give your own wrath time to abate*.”

20. *Therefore]* The whole verse, except the connecting Particle, is taken exactly from the LXX, Prov. xxv. 21, 22. The Particle *οὐν* introduces the precept as an inference from the truth that vengeance belongeth only unto the Lord. A various reading (*ἀλλά*) of at least equal authority (Tisch. 8) gives a slightly different connexion: “*avenge not yourselves, . . . but show kindness to your enemy.*”

*coals of fire;*] A full discussion of the phrase “*thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head*,” belongs to Prov. xxv. 21; but we must briefly consider it in connexion with the present context.

(a.) According to Chrysostom, and other Greek Fathers, the “*coals of fire*” are God’s sore judgments, which will be heaped upon the sinner who hardens himself against deeds of love.

(1.) In favour of this interpretation are the

apparent sense of the phrase in 2 Esdras xvi. 53, “*Let not the sinner say that he hath not sinned: for God shall burn coals of fire upon his head, which saith before the Lord God and his glory, I have not sinned.*”

(2.) The reference to divine judgments in the present context, “*vengeance is Mine, I will repay.*”

The chief objection is that urged by Augustine: “How is it consistent with love, to give food and drink to an enemy in order to heap coals of fire upon his head, if coals of fire here signify some heavy punishment?”

The objection is commonly met by a reference to such passages as Ps. xxxvii. 34, lviii. 10; Prov. xix. 16; Luke xviii. 7; 2 Tim. iv. 14; and by the explanation that the “*coals of fire*” will be heaped only upon the impenitent, while deeds of love are meant to lead to repentance.

(b.) Augustine and other Latin Fathers understand “*coals of fire heaped on the head*” as an oriental figure of the *burning pains* of shame and remorse: and in support of this view we must observe that a very similar mode of expression is found in Proverbs close to the verses which St. Paul has quoted: “*a soft tongue breaketh the bone*” (Prov. xxv. 15).

The passage thus means, show to thine enemy such kindness as shall make him ashamed of his hatred; so wilt thou inflict the sharpest and the most salutary pain. The figure is probably that of the melting-pots. As the object of heaping coals of fire on a vessel is to melt down its contents, so here the object is to melt a stubborn heart, a process not least painful when effected by undeserved kindness. This interpretation is confirmed by the closing sentence of Prov. xxv. 22 (not quoted by St. Paul), “*and the Lord shall reward thee*,” namely, for the good deeds done to thine enemy.

The sense thus confirmed by the context of the original passage is required also by the present context, the general thought of which is summed up in the next verse, “*Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.*”

The phrase “*thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head*,” would be in the first sense (a) an incongruous appendix to the quotation, but in the latter sense (b) it helps powerfully to enforce the duty of loving our enemies, which is the main subject of the passage.

## CHAPTER XIII.

**I** Subjection, and many other duties, we owe to the magistrates. 8 Love is the fulfilling of the law. 11 Gluttony and drunkenness, and the works of darkness, are out of season in the time of the gospel.

**L** ET every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there

is no power but of God : the powers that be are <sup>1</sup>ordained of God. <sup>1Or.  
ordered.</sup>

**2** Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God : and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.

**3** For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt

## CHAP. XIII.—CHRISTIAN DUTIES, POLITICAL AND SOCIAL.

**1-7. OBEDIENCE TO RULERS.**—From exhortations to live peaceably with all men, and abstain from revenge, St. Paul passes naturally, but without any express mark of connexion, to the duty of obedience to civil authorities. This is a subject rarely noticed in his other epistles: see 1 Tim. ii. 2. Why then does he treat it so fully and emphatically in writing to the Romans?

(1.) The Jews at Rome were notorious for their turbulence; see note on Acts xviii. 2; and the Christians being regarded as a Jewish sect, and being actually followers of a Jewish Messiah, were likely to be suspected of revolutionary tendencies. How easily suspicion could be turned against them was seen a few years later in Nero's persecution.

(2.) There was a real danger that Christians themselves, even those of Heathen origin, might be misled by false notions of Christ's kingdom and its relation to the kingdoms of this world.

(3.) This danger was greatest at Rome, where Christianity was brought face to face with the Imperial power: for the Roman government, regarding religion as a matter of state policy, sternly repressed every innovation which threatened to disturb the public peace.

But though the circumstances of the Roman Christians may have furnished the occasion for the admonition, and prudence may have suggested the need of it, the duty of obedience is enforced by other and far higher motives. M. Renan's remark ('Saint Paul,' p. 477) that "Paul had too much tact to be an agitator," and wished the Christian to be "a man of order en règle with the police, of good repute in the eyes of Pagans," —is an unworthy travesty of the Apostle's teaching.

**1. Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers.]** "Let every soul submit to higher powers."

"Every soul," though a common expression for "every man," retains a certain emphasis and pathos, which appeal for hearty obedience.

"Higher powers" (Wyclif's excellent ren-

dering) include both the person and office of such as are set in authority: compare Wisd. vi. 5; 1 Tim. ii. 2; 1 Pet. ii. 13.

*For there is no power but of God, &c.]* Read, "For there is no power except from God: but the powers that be have been ordained by God." In enforcing the duty of submission, St. Paul clearly asserts a divine right of civil government, as derived from God the source of all authority and power: and he extends that divine right to all "*de facto*" rulers "as the bearers of a divinely ordained office" (Meyer), but does not touch any question of the Christian's duty in reference to conflicting claims on his allegiance.

**2. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power.]** Read, "So that he which setteth himself against the power." The Greek words in vv. 1, 2 which we have rendered "submit," "ordained," "setteth himself against," and "ordinant," have all the same root, and give to the passage an antithetical force which cannot be preserved in English.

*and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.]* Read, "Shall upon themselves bring judgment;" see note on Matt. xxiii. 14. Here, though the judgment comes from Him whose ordinance is resisted, it is not *damnation* in the world to come, but temporal punishment executed by rulers as God's ministers in this world.

**3. For rulers are not a terror to good works.]** Read, "to the good work." The "work" is mentioned rather than the worker, because the power of rulers extends only to men's actions. The verse shows why judgment will overtake those who resist, namely, because the office of the civil power is not to subvert but to maintain that moral order which is in its origin divine. St. Paul is enforcing the duties of subjects, and therefore regards rulers only as acting according to the true idea of their office. He was in fact writing in the earlier and better part of Nero's reign, while Seneca and Burrhus were still in power, before any general persecution of the Christians, but after he had himself suffered grievous injustice from the civil power (Acts xi. 37; 2 Cor. xi. 25, 32). His argument

thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same:

4 For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.

5 Wherefore ye must needs be

applies to all forms of government, and to Heathen as well as Christian rulers: it has "a general validity based on the divinely ordained position of the magistracy, and not annulled by their injustice in practice" (Meyer). There is as little reason for Renan's sarcastic exclamation that "Nero was proclaimed by St. Paul a minister, an officer of God, a representative of Divine authority!" —as for Volkmar's wild conjecture that the second beast in the Apocalypse (xiii. 12), who caused "the earth and them whib dwell therein to worship the first beast," represented St. Paul here recommending obedience to civil government.

*thou shalt have praise of the same.]* Read, "praise from it," i.e. from the power.

4. *For he is the minister of God to thee for good.]* Confirmation of the last clause of v. 3, with which it should have been joined. The civil power (*εγονοια*, v. 3) is God's minister, and as such exists only for good to him that doeth good: 1 Tim. ii. 2.

*be beareth not the sword in vain:]* The sword as the emblem of the power of life and death was borne habitually (*φορεῖν*) by, or before, the higher magistrates, and that "not in vain" but with a serious purpose, for use against evil-doers. "Qui universas provincias regunt, jus gladii habent" (Ulpian, 'Dig.' I. 18, 6, § 8, quoted by Tholuck).

The Apostle in this passage expressly vindicates the right of capital punishment as divinely entrusted to the magistrate, "for he is God's minister," appointed to execute His righteous vengeance.

*a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.]* Read, "an avenger for wrath unto him that doeth evil." The words "for wrath" (omitted in a few MSS) answer to the preceding words "for good," and their genuineness is confirmed by the renewed mention of "the wrath" (*τὴν ὀργὴν*) in the next verse.

5. *Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath but also for conscience sake.]*

subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake.

6 For for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing.

7 Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour.

Read, "Wherefore ye must needs submit, not only for the wrath," &c. The necessity is twofold, external on account of "the wrath" which the magistrate executes, and internal on account of conscience towards God. We thus see that "wherefore" refers to the whole passage (vv. 1-4) as setting forth the grounds of obedience.

6. *For for this cause pay ye tribute also:]* To avoid ambiguity, read, "ye pay tribute also," Confirmation of v. 5. In the fact of paying tribute you acknowledge that character of the civil power which entitles it to obedience, namely that it is an ordinance of God "for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well" (1 Pet. ii. 14).

*for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing.]* Read, "for they are ministers of God, labouring constantly unto this very end."

The A.V. has here 'God's ministers,' and in v. 4 'the ministers of God.' The expressions are altered in both verses in the version of "Five Clergymen," which I have followed for this reason, that in v. 4 the idea of serving on behalf of God is implied in *διάκονος*; whilst here that of serving or ministering to God on behalf of the people seems to be included also in *λειτουργοὶ θεῷ*. (Riddle in Lange.)

A ministerial, not necessarily priestly, character is thus ascribed to rulers (see note on xv. 16): they labour "unto this very end," i.e. unto that service of God which is described in vv. 3, 4, and referred to in the words "for this cause."

7. *Render therefore to all their dues:]* Omit "therefore." The verse is a summary exhortation, based on the nature of civil government as stated in vv. 5, 6, and appended without any conjunction, as in xii. 21. "Render to all who are in authority whatever they are entitled to claim."

*tribute to whom tribute is due.]* This is an excellent rendering of St. Paul's brief and

**8** Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law.

**9** For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if *there be* any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying,

elliptical sentence. The complete expression would be—"to him that claims tribute, render tribute:" but the shorter phrase is equally clear and far more forcible.

"*Tribute*" (*φόπος*), any direct tax on person or real property, and "*custom*" (*τέλος*), any indirect tax or toll on goods (Matt. xvii. 25; Lu. xx. 22), were both paid to the Roman government, and the agents who collected them were, to the Jews at least, objects of popular hatred and contempt. When, therefore, St. Paul exhorts his readers at Rome not only to submit to taxation, but to regard their rulers with due fear and honour, his counsel is in strong contrast to that of the "seducers and deceivers" who at this period were exciting the fierce fanaticism of their countrymen in Judaea, and "under pretence of inspiration were plotting innovations and revolutions" (Joseph. 'B. J.' II. xiii. 3). "The Jews at Rome shared the same turbulent spirit" (Suet. 'Claudius,' c. 25).

It is worthy of notice that the extortion of the Publicans had become so intolerable, that a few months after the date of this Epistle Nero proposed to the Senate the most stringent and sweeping reforms: see Tacitus, 'Annals,' xiii. 50.

#### 8-10. EXHORTATION TO MUTUAL LOVE.

**8. Owe no man any thing, but to love one another:]** From the duties that must be paid to all in authority, St. Paul passes very naturally to the wider duty of loving all men. "Pay every debt, let none remain due to any man, save that 'immortal debt' (Bengel) of mutual love which, however fully paid, is still for ever due."

*for he that loveth another]* Read, "*for he that loveth his neighbour;*" &c.

So Wicilf rightly renders *τὸν ἄτερον, i.e. "the other"* implied in the expression "*to love one another;*" compare ii. 1, 21.

*bath fulfilled the law.]* "In and with the loving there has taken place what the Mosaic law prescribes in respect of duties towards one's neighbour, inasmuch as he who loves does not commit adultery, does not kill, steal, covet." (Meyer.) But see more in the note on v. 10.

hended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

**10 Love worketh no ill to his neighbour:** therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.

**11 And that, knowing the time,** that now *it is* high time to awake out of sleep: for now *is* our salvation nearer than when we believed.

**9. On the order of the commandments of the 2nd Table, see note on Ex. xx.**

*Thou shalt not bear false witness,*] The addition of this clause to the original text, in order to supply a supposed omission, is proved to be needless by what follows, "*and if there be any other commandment.*"

*it is briefly comprehended*] Or, "*it is summed up.*" In Lev. xix. 18, sundry laws forbidding injury to one's neighbour are summed up in a saying which contains them all in principle, as it also contains all the commandments of the Decalogue, to which St. Paul here applies it. The several laws which flow from love are thus gathered up again in love, their fountain head.

**10. Love worketh no ill]** This emphatic rendering of the words *οὐκ ἔγνωσεν* is justified by their position. "*Love*" (personified as in 1 Cor. xiii.) "*worketh no ill to his neighbour,*" neither the ills forbidden in the several commandments, nor any other.

*therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.]* "*Love therefore is the fulfilment of law.*" Compare v. 8. The argument of this passage is satisfied, if it be limited to the law of Moses, and its special prohibitions: but it is probable that St. Paul, by using *vōmos* without the article, pointed to a larger sense in which love is the fulfilment of law. For viewed in its idea and essence as a revelation of God's will, "*law*" requires for its fulfilment that we should not only cease to do evil, but learn to do well.

**11-14. After his full explanation in vv. 8-10 of the exhortation, "Owe no man any thing, but to love one another," St. Paul now resumes the exhortation, and enforces it by a special motive drawn from the shortness of the time, and then upon this motive founds fresh exhortations to vigilance and holiness.**

**11. And that, knowing the time.]** "*And that, because ye know the season.*" On *καὶ τοῦτο* compare 1 Cor. vi. 6, 8; Eph. ii. 8. It recalls with fresh emphasis the preceding thought, "*Owe nothing but love,*" which is itself the comprehensive summary of all the

**12** The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light.

**13** Let us walk <sup>honestly,</sup> as in the day; not in rioting and drunken-

ness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying.

**14** But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof.

Christian duties enforced in this and the preceding chapter.

On *εἰδότες*, see note on vii. 7.

*that now it is high time to awake out of sleep:* Read, “*that it is time for us at once to awake,*” &c.

The pronoun “*us*” (or “*you*”), omitted in the A. V., is addressed to believers (*ἐπιστρέφαντες*), and demands of them an earnest vigilance, compared with which their ordinary life is as a “*sleep*” of the soul. So in the parable of the virgins, “*they all slumbered and slept.*”

*for now is our salvation nearer]* “*for now is salvation nearer to us.*” This latter rendering is favoured by the order of the words. The “*salvation*” meant is evidently the full and final salvation which shall accompany the second coming of the Lord. When St. Paul says of this that it is “*nearer than when we believed*,” it is clear that he thought Christ’s coming nigh at hand. The short time since St. Paul and his readers first “*believed*” would have brought the Advent seemingly no nearer, had it been regarded as indefinitely distant. In fact, a constant expectation of the day of the Lord as fast approaching is the very attitude of mind which Christ Himself enjoined in His repeated warnings.

That expectation had from the first been modified by the caution, “*Of that day and hour knoweth no man*” (Matt. xxiv. 36). In St. Paul’s mind the expectation was vivid (1 Thess. iv. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 52), but the caution was not forgotten (1 Thess. v. 1, 2; 2 Thess. ii. 1).

The Aorist *ἐπιστρέφαντες* points back to the first acceptance of the faith: compare 1 Cor. iii. 5; xv. 2; Acts xix. 2.

**12. The night is far spent, the day is at hand.]** Having compared the present moral condition of his readers to “*sleep*,” the Apostle carries on the figure, contrasting the present life with that which is to come as night with day: compare Heb. x. 25.

*let us therefore cast off the works of darkness,*] In accordance with the figurative use of “*sleep*” and “*night*,” the “*darkness*” also is to be understood in a moral sense, and “*the works of darkness*” are not only such deeds of violence or lust as men seek to hide under cover of night (1 Thess. v. 7; Ephes. v. 11), but generally all sinful deeds whose

natural element is the state of spiritual darkness. All these, says the Apostle, “*let us cast off*,” as men arising out of sleep lay aside the garments worn during the night. For the literal sense of *ἀποθύμεθα* see Acts vii. 58, and for its application to moral habits compare Eph. iv. 22, 25; Col. iii. 8; James i. 21; 1 Peter ii. 1; Heb. xii. 1.

*and let us put on the armour of light.]* The interpretation “*bright shining armour*,” does not agree with the figure employed, of night and day. “*The armour of the light,*” is the armour belonging to and worn during the light, that with which the Christian must be found clad in the day of Christ’s coming, when the true heavenly light will arise and shine: compare Eph. vi. 11.

**13. Let us walk honestly, as in the day.]** For “*honestly*” (1 Thess. iv. 12), which is now seldom used in its proper Latin sense, read “*seemly*” or “*becomingly*.” Compare xii. 17, where “*things honest*” mean “*things becoming*,” and 1 Cor. xiv. 40, where for “*decently*” read “*becomingly*.” “*As if the day, which is so near at hand, were already present, so let us walk becomingly.*” (Photius.)

To this passage St. Augustine (*“Confessions,” viii. 12, 23*) attributes his own remarkable conversion: “I seized the book, opened it, and read in silence the passage on which my eyes were first cast, ‘*Not in revellings and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and jealousy; but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh unto lusts.*’ I had no wish, no need, to read further: for at the end of this sentence immediately, as if the light of full assurance had been poured into my heart, the darkness of my doubts all fled away.” For “*envying*” read “*jealousy*.” Revelry is followed on the one hand by lasciviousness, and on the other by strife and jealous wrath (*ζῆλος*, Acts xiii. 45).

**14. But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ.]** In Gal. iii. 27 (written only a few months before this Epistle) St. Paul says that “all who were baptised into Christ did put on Christ,” *i. e.* entered into fellowship of life with Him, and became members of Him. The fact of union with Christ, there asserted in the dogmatic sense, is the ground of the exhortation in this passage to “*put on*

Christ" in the ethical sense, i. e. to clothe the soul in the moral disposition and habits of Christ. The essential element of this union is the Spirit of Christ, and the Spirit's power is needed continually to maintain and develope the life once bestowed. Each new step in the development of this life may be regarded as a new putting on of Christ, and so may be the subject, as here, of special exhortation. Compare Gal. iv. 19, "little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you."

*and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof.]* Literally, *unto lusts*. If σάρξ has here a purely physiological sense (Philippi) as denoting the material of the

body, the prohibition is not absolute but limited by the words *unto lusts* (*εἰς ἐπιθυμίας*): take not care of the body to such an extent as to excite lusts (Meyer), or rather "in order to gratify lusts."

But the opposition between "putting on the Lord Jesus Christ" and "taking forethought for the flesh" makes it more probable that σάρξ here, as in cc. vii. and viii., denotes the flesh in its *sensuality and sinfulness*: and so the Apostle forbids altogether any forethought for its indulgence as necessarily aiming at, or at least tending to, the excitement and gratification of sinful lusts. The words *unto lusts* thus strengthen instead of limiting the prohibition.

#### ADDITIONAL NOTE on v. 1.

The reading ὑπό θεοῦ instead of ἀπὸ θεοῦ, though found in the oldest MSS. and generally adopted by critical Editors, is still regarded by many of the best interpreters as the error of a copyist misled by the ὑπό of the following clause.

The received Text (*ἀπὸ θεοῦ*) certainly seems to give a better and more pointed sense, by distinguishing the Divine origin of civil government in general from the actual establishment by God's Providence of existing governments.

### CHAPTER XIV.

**3 Men may not condemn nor condemn one the other for things indifferent: 13 but take heed that they give no offence in them: 15 for that the apostle proverbs unlawful by many reasons.**

**H**IM that is weak in the faith receive ye, but<sup>1</sup> not to doubtful disputations.

**2 For one believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs.**

Or, not to judge his doubtful thoughts.

#### CHAP. XIV.—EXHORTATION TO MUTUAL FORBEARANCE AMONG CHRISTIANS.

The great principle of Christian love commended in the preceding chapter is here applied to enforce the special duty of mutual forbearance in things indifferent. This general connexion of thought between the two chapters is clear and unquestionable: the more immediate and formal connexion being less obvious has been much disputed.

(1.) The expectation of the Second Advent, introduced as a motive to mutual love (xiii. 11), is naturally accompanied by an exhortation to watchfulness and purity (xiii. 12–14); and from this *incidental* admonition St. Paul now returns to his main thought (Fritzsche).

(2.) The warning against excessive indulgence of the flesh leads by a natural transition and contrast to the case of those who from weakness of faith observe an over-scrupulous asceticism (Meyer).

These views are both partially true, and both incomplete.

The expectation of Christ's second coming

to judge the world runs through the whole passage (xiii. 11, xiv. 4, 10–12), as the constraining motive to mutual charity and forbearance.

Before applying this motive in c. xiv., to appease dissensions which were occasioned chiefly by a superstitious observance of things morally indifferent, the Apostle, with admirable wisdom, draws first from the thought of coming judgment a note of warning, not needed, especially among his Gentile readers, against a licentious abuse of Christian liberty; and so passes over (δι, xiv. 1) to the opposite and less dangerous error or infirmity, for which he claims a charitable forbearance from those whose consciences were more robust.

**1. Him that is weak in the faith.]** "But him that is weak in faith." Ἡ πίστις does not here mean "the faith," i. e. the doctrine believed, but the man's own Christian faith in its moral and practical bearing, as a conviction of right and wrong: compare vv. 22, 23. The weakness is described by a

3 Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him.

4 Who art thou that judgest ano-

ther man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand.

5 One man esteemeth one day

Participle, not by an Adjective, and thus (as Godet rightly observes) is not treated as an inherent and permanent defect of character.

*receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations.]* “receive ye, not unto discussion of doubts.” Admit the weak brother to Christian fellowship, take him to yourselves, but not to discuss and pass judgments upon any doubts that he entertains. This plea for a kindly reception of the weak brethren implies that they, i. e. the Jewish Christians, were not the predominant part of the Christian community at Rome. For διακρίσεις see 1 Cor. xii. 10; Heb. v. 14: and for διάλογυμῶν see note on i. 21. The meaning “doubts” is clear in Phil. ii. 14.

2. For one believeth that he may eat all things:] “One man hath faith to eat all things.” For this meaning of πιστεῖ compare Demosthenes, ‘Against Onetor,’ p. 866 (προέσθαι δὲ τὴν προΐκήν οὐκ ἐπιστευεῖ), “he had not confidence, i. e. was too cautious, to give up the dowry.”

*another, who is weak, eateth herbs.]* “But he that is weak,” &c. The scruple here described refers to eating flesh at all, not only flesh of unclean animals or of idol-sacrifices. The weak Christian lived on vegetables.

In regard to the motive of this scrupulous abstinence, see Introduction, § 7.

St. Paul, regarding the matter itself as indifferent, expresses no disapproval of either practice, but only of the uncharitable feelings with which it may be associated. The strong must not despise the weak as narrow-minded and superstitious, nor the weak judge and condemn the strong as unscrupulous and irreverent. Similar cautions are much needed in discussions of the present day concerning “temperance.”

3. for God hath received him.] Compare Pss. xxvii. 10, lxxv. 4, lxxxiii. 24, where the LXX use the same Greek word, also John xiv. 3; Rom. xv. 7; and Clemens Rom., 1 Cor. 49: ἐν ἀγάπῃ προσέλαβετο ἡμᾶς ὁ Δεσπότης. St. Paul's meaning is, “Condemn not for his freedom the man whom God has taken to Himself and received into His Church in this freedom.” 1 Cor. x. 29; Gal. v. 13.

4. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant?] Read, “another's servant,” i. e. God's, or Christ's, according as Θεός or Κύρος is adopted in the close of the verse. The question, “Who art thou?” addressed to

“the weak” in faith, rebukes his presumption in condemning the freedom which God has not condemned. Compare ix. 20.

The word *oikérns*, rare in N. T., denotes a household servant, distinguished from ordinary slaves (Plat. Legg. vi., p. 763 A) as being more closely connected with the family. (Meyer.)

*to his own master be standeth or falleth.]* The figurative expression “standeth or falleth” is variously understood:

(1.) He is acquitted or condemned, not by your judgment, but by that of God (Ps. i. 5; Lu. xxi. 36; 1 Cor. iv. 4).

(2.) Whether in the use of his liberty he does well or ill, stands upright or falls into sin, is a matter that concerns his own Master, not thee (1 Cor. x. 12, xvi. 13; 1 Thess. iii. 8, &c.; c. xi. 22). This latter interpretation is confirmed by what follows. What St. Paul thus forbids is not a kindly concern for a fellow-servant's safety, but a censorious interference with his freedom. For the Dative see Winer, pp. 263, 265, and below, vv. 6, 7, 8.

*Yea, he shall be holden up.]* Read, “But he shall stand.” Matt. xii. 26; Lu. xi. 18; 2 Cor. xiii. 1.

*for God is able to make him stand.]* Read, “for the Lord is mighty,” &c.: Wiclif's vigorous rendering, based on the reading of nearly all the best MSS and oldest versions (δύναται γάρ ὁ Κύρος). St. Paul's confident assurance that the man, who in the strength of faith asserts his freedom in things indifferent, will be kept in his uprightness, rests on the might of Christ “the Lord.”

5. One man esteemeth one day above another.] If for “(yáp) be restored (Tisch. 8), it must be regarded either as a repetition, or better as a confirmation, of the yáp in v. 2, i. e. it strengthens the argument for the precept of v. 1, by a second example of difference between the weak and the strong in faith: “one man chooseth day before day: another chooseth every day.” For the meaning of κρίω see Plato, ‘Republic,’ iii. 399, F., and Aeschylus, ‘Agamemnon,’ 471; and for the subject matter compare Col. ii. 16, “Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day (feast), or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days.” From that passage and from Gal. iv. 10, we see that Jewish Christians who were weak

above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.

<sup>1 Or, fully assured.</sup> <sup>1 Or, observeth.</sup> 6 He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks.

in faith were still influenced by a superstitious reverence for days and seasons which had been held sacred among the Jews. A rigid observance of the Sabbath was especially characteristic of the Essenes. Compare Ecclesiasticus xxxiii. 7—9: and on the Judaizing element in the Roman Church, see Introduction, § 7. There is not the slightest reason to suppose, with Ewald, that St. Paul is referring to the observance of the Lord's day.

*Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.*] The observance of this or that day being in itself a thing indifferent, it is enough that he who observes it and he who does not should "each be fully assured in his own mind" that he is doing right. The "mind" (*νοῦς*) is the seat of moral consciousness, and therefore of the "full assurance of faith:" cf. viii. 23, and iv. 21 (*πληροφορεῖσθαι*).

6. *He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord.*] "**H**e that mindeth the day, to the Lord he mindeth it." It being presupposed that each is fully assured in his own mind that he is doing right, then he that sets his mind upon the day in question (*τὴν ἡμέραν*) and is zealous for its observance (*φρονεῖν*, Matt. xvi. 23; Phil. iii. 19; Col. iii. 2), does so for the Lord's sake, considering that "*this day is holy to the Lord*" (1 Esdras ix. 52).

The clause, "*and be that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it,*" must be omitted on overwhelming evidence: it seems to have been added for the sake of completeness, being implied in the Apostle's argument.

"The setting apart of special days for the service of God is a confession of our imperfect state, an avowal that we cannot or do not devote our whole time to Him. Sabbaths will then ultimately be superseded, when our life becomes one eternal Sabbath" (Bp. Lightfoot on Coloss. ii. 18).

*He that eateth, &c.*] The man who eats flesh, eats it unto the Lord, because he deems it right to use what God has given him for

7 For none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself.

8 For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's.

9 For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.

use; and he shows that he is fully assured of this, "for he giveth God thanks."

In like manner "*be that eateth not*" flesh "*eateth not*" for the Lord's sake, and accordingly "*gives thanks to God*" for the simpler meal that he allows himself.

This passage proves the universal custom of thanksgiving before a meal (Matt. xv. 36; Acts xxvii. 35; 1 Cor. x. 30, xi. 24; 1 Tim. iv. 4, 5).

For the Datives see note on v. 4.

7, 8. Confirmation of the particular statements in v. 6 by the universal principle on which they rest.

In observing or not observing special days, and in eating or not eating flesh, a Christian (who is fully assured) does all "*unto the Lord:*" for this is the conscious aim of his existence, to live "*not unto himself*," not for his own will and pleasure, but "*unto the Lord*," for His glory, and according to His will.

Moreover he that thus lives unto the Lord, also dies unto the Lord: the ruling principle of the life is strong in death. "It is a great art to die well, and to be learnt by men in health." (Jeremy Taylor, 'Holy Dying').

"*We are the Lord's*," not our own, but His property, devoting ourselves to His service and assured of His protection. The Apostle in vv. 7, 8 is speaking of believers only.

9. *For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived,*] "*For to this end Christ died and became alive.*" The shorter reading is best attested, and explains the variations: it also corresponds best with the following clause, "*that he might be Lord both of dead and living.*"

The Christian's relation to his Lord, both in life and in death, is founded on the facts of Christ's personal history. For the life which the Christian lives "*unto the Lord*" is also a new life (v. 4) derived from the new life of Christ, which made Him Lord of dead and living: compare viii. 38; Phil. i. 20. The new life on which Christ entered after His resurrection is described not by *ἀνέγεντα*, but

**10** But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for ‘we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.’

<sup>2 Cor. 5.  
23.</sup> **11** For it is written, <sup>a</sup>As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.

by the simple verb *εἶπον* (as in Apoc. i. 18, ii. 8; Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11), to correspond more closely with *ζήτωσεν*.

The emphasis is of course on the words “*both dead and living*,” as is shown by the καὶ—καὶ, and required by the connexion with *vv. 7, 8.*

Observe in *εἶπον* the inceptive force of the Aorist, “*became alive*,” for which compare the Additional Note on i. 13, and Bernhardy, ‘*Syntax*,’ p. 382.

**10.** *But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother?* Read, “*But thou, why judgest thou thy brother? Or thou too, why dost thou set at nought thy brother?*”

If Christ is the Lord of all, what right has the weak to judge, or the strong to despise his brother? For, instead of judging each other, all are to be judged by the Lord. “*All*” is placed emphatically first, as the force of the argument rests on the universality of the judgment: compare ii. 6, 16, iii. 6, &c.

*the judgment seat of Christ.]* Read, “*the judgment seat of God*,” and compare 2 Cor. v. 10, which was probably the source of the reading “*Christ*.”

**11.** The certainty of the universal judgment is attested by the solemn declaration of Isaiah xlvi. 23, where for the Hebrew phrase, “*By myself have I sworn*” (Gen. xxii. 16), which is literally rendered in LXX, St. Paul, quoting from memory, substitutes the more frequent form, “*I live*,” equivalent to “*By my own life I swear*”: compare Num. xiv. 21, 22, 28; Deut. xxxii. 40, where the LXX have ζῶ ἔγώ ὅτι.

*said the Lord.]* Added to Isaiah’s words by St. Paul, to show that it is God who speaks.

The words which follow in Isaiah, “*the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return*,” being only a further asseveration, are omitted by St. Paul.

*every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.]* Isai. xlvi. 23. The Hebrew is correctly rendered in the A. V., “*Unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear*.”

Compare Jer. xliv. 26, where for “*sworn*”

**12** So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.

**13** Let us not therefore judge one another any more: but judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling-block or an occasion to fall in *his* brother’s way.

**14** I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that *there is* nothing

there is, as here, a various reading in LXX, “*confessed*.”

In Isaiah the oath of homage (Isai. xix. 18; Jos. xxiii. 7; 2 Chr. xv. 14), as well as the bended knee, marks the adoring submission of the whole world to Jehovah, and the solemn confession of His sovereignty.

The notion of “*confessing sins to the Judge*” (Ecumenius) is out of place in this verse, though it follows in the next.

**12.** *So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.]* “*So then each one of us for himself shall give account to God.*” On God’s supremacy rests His exclusive right of judgment: so when the former is confessed by “*every tongue*,” it follows that each will answer for himself to his rightful Judge. By bringing together the emphatic words, “*each one of us for himself*,” we give prominence to the exact point, on which the application in the next verse is based.

**13.** *Let us not therefore judge one another any more:]* “*No longer therefore let us judge one another.*” The warning against judging is now addressed to both parties, and so St. Paul passes over to the admonition addressed to the strong in faith.

*but judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling-block or an occasion to fall in his brother’s way.]* “*But judge ye this rather, not to put an offence before your brother, or a stumbling-block.*”

The two words πρόσκομψα and σκάνδαλον differ in their proper material sense as a “*block*” against which the foot strikes, and a “*trap*” in which it is caught; but in the figurative and moral sense they are used indifferently, and rendered in the A. V. either “*offence*,” or “*stumbling-block*.” See notes on ix. 33, Matt. xvi. 23. Here it is better to render πρόσκομψα by the same word “*offence*” as in v. 20.

*judge this] “judge ye this.”* The Pronoun must be expressed in English to show the change of Person: let this be your judgment and your determination. For this sense of κρίνω see 1 Cor. ii. 2; 2 Cor. ii. 1; Tit. iii. 12.

**14.** *by the Lord Jesus,]* Read “*in the Lord*

<sup>1 Gr. com-</sup> <sup>mon.</sup> <sup>1 Gr. com-</sup> <sup>mon.</sup> <sup>1 Gr. ac-</sup> <sup>cording to</sup> <sup>charity.</sup> <sup>1 Cor. 8.</sup> <sup>ii.</sup> 'unclean of itself: but to him that esteemeth any thing to be 'unclean, to him it is unclean.'

15 But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died.

*Jesus.*" The conviction is that of a mind dwelling in communion with Christ, and therefore enlightened by His Spirit.

"Nothing," i. e., according to the context, no kind of food.

"Unclean:" Marg. "common;" see notes on Acts x. 14, 28; xi. 8.

"Unclean of itself:" δι' ἑαροῦ, "per se," "of its own nature," apart from conscientious scruples. The rendering "through him" (δι' αἵροῦ, referred to Christ) "that is, on account of His evangelic legislation" (Theodoret) is fantastic and arbitrary. The meaning is not that the distinction between clean and unclean meats was abolished: for "the weak in faith" objected to eating flesh at all, and this objection was not founded on the law of Moses, but on ascetic notions, such as those of the Essenes.

*but to him, &c.*] Read, "except to him," &c. It is not "unclean of itself," it is not unclean "except," &c.: compare for this use of εἰ μή Luke iv. 26, 27; Gal. i. 7, ii. 16, &c. Thus in enforcing the admonition of v. 13, St. Paul first asserts fully and directly the principle of freedom, and then adds the exception, by which its practice ought to be modified: for the scruple of the weak brother is valid so far as his conscience is concerned. It is this exception that forms the essential part of the argument, for on this is founded the preceding exhortation not to scandalise the weak brother.

15. *But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat,*] "For if because of meat thy brother is grieved" (Rheims). "For" is unquestionably the true reading, it brings in a reason for the exhortation expressed in v. 13, and founded on the closing words of v. 14.

The whole argument is perfectly clear when we reduce St. Paul's rhetorical style to the simpler logical order:

(1.) "to him it is unclean" (v. 14).  
(2.) "put not a stumbling-block in his way" (v. 13).

(3.) "for if because of meat thy brother is grieved, thou art no longer walking according to charity" (v. 15).

*Destroy not,* &c.] The weak brother is "grieved" i. e. vexed in conscience, morally pained (Eph. iv. 30) by seeing the strong indulge in what he deems sinful. This grief

16 Let not then your good be evil spoken of:

17 For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.

18 For he that in these things

may tend to his destruction, and that in more ways than one: he may either be repelled from the Christian faith, which seems to be associated with sinful practice, or he may be seduced by your example into a cowardly acquiescence in that which to him is sinful (1 Cor. viii. 12). Give up thy freedom and eat no flesh, rather than thus lead into perdition him for whom Christ gave up His life to save him from perdition. "Make not thy meat of more account than Christ made His life" (Bengel).

"Thy meat," "that meat of thine": there is a touch of scorn in the pronoun; "Non sine indignatione pronomen adjectum" (Beelen).

16. *Let not therefore your good be evil spoken of;*] This is addressed, as the whole passage (vv. 13-23), to those who are strong in faith: the Plural is used in laying down general principles (vv. 1. 7-9, 13, 16, 19; xv. 1), the Singular in applying them to special cases (vv. 2-6, 10, 15, 20-23).

"Your good," which is emphatically your special advantage, can only mean, in accordance with the context, your stronger faith and fuller liberty; the reading "our good" would give the same general sense, referring to the "knowledge and persuasion in the Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean in itself" (v. 14). Compare 1 Cor. viii. 4, 7, 9; x. 29, 30.

Let no uncharitable use of your liberty give occasion to the weak in faith to condemn and speak evil of that which is to you a real good.

17. *For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink;*] "The kingdom of God, typified by the O. T. theocracy, is God's dominion over the heart, instituted and administered by Christ: it is the heavenly sphere of life, in which God's word and Spirit govern, and whose organ on earth is the Church" (Lange). Here the Apostle's point of view is that of our Saviour's saying (Luke xvii. 20, where, however, see note), "The kingdom of God is within you": its essence lies not in things external, as eating and drinking, but in the inward graces of the spiritual life. The following clause, "be that in these things serveth Christ," shows that these graces are here regarded as active principles of the Christian life.

serveth Christ *is acceptable to God, and approved of men.*

19 Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another.

20 For meat destroy not the work of God. *All things indeed are*

<sup>a</sup> Tit. i. 15.

*"Righteousness"* is therefore presented not in its judicial aspect as the relation established by God's justifying sentence, but in its moral aspect as a grace to be exercised and developed, as in fact "the germ, of which holiness is the unfolded and perfected plant" (Forbes): compare vi. 19, Eph. iv. 24, and note on i. 17.

"Peace" in like manner is not simply the state of reconciliation to God (v. 1), but the resulting disposition, the spirit of peace abiding in the heart and shedding a holy calm over the life.

*"Joy in the Holy Ghost"* is the holy gladness which the Spirit of God breathes around those who "*live in the Spirit*": Gal. v. 22, 25; Rom. xv. 13; 1 Thess. i. 6.

The strongest in faith best know that "*the kingdom of God*" consists in these spiritual graces, not in anything external as eating or drinking; they therefore ought to be most ready to use their liberty in such matters wisely and charitably. Thus with admirable skill and force of argument, the Apostle appeals to faith itself against any misuse of the liberty which faith bestows.

18. *For he that in these things serveth Christ*] The variation "*he that herein serveth Christ* (*ἐν τοῖς τροφαῖς*)" is most strongly attested; it extends the thought from the three graces just mentioned to the whole sphere in which they are combined. He "*herein serveth Christ*," who for the love of Christ serves his brethren in the exercise of such graces as righteousness, peace, and joy; and so doing he is both "*well pleasing to God*," who judges the heart, and "*approved by men*," who see his good deeds. Thus he wins the goodwill of his brother, instead of putting a stumbling-block in his way.

19. *the things which make for peace,*] More simply "*the things of peace*." The exhortation, "*let us follow*," founded on vv. 17, 18, gives a much better sense than either a question, "*Do we then follow?*" or an assertion of the Apostle's own practice, "*We therefore follow.*"

*and things wherewith one may edify another.*] Compare 1 Thess. v. 11.

20. *For meat, destroy not.*] Read *destroy*

pure; but *it is evil* for that man who eateth with offence.

21. *It is good neither to eat flesh,* <sup>b</sup> Cor. a <sup>13.</sup> nor to drink wine, nor *any thing* whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak.

22. *Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God.* Happy is he

*thou not:* the Singular marks the return to the special case; see note on v. 16.

"*The work of God*" must be understood in accordance with the exhortation in v. 19 to "edify" or build up each other. Thy brother, as a Christian, is "*God's building*" (1 Cor. iii. 9). Do not for the sake of mere food fight against God by pulling down and destroying what He has built up. "*Destroy*" is here used in its proper etymological sense (*κατάλυε*, "destrue") not, as in v. 15, in the sense of eternal perdition (*ἀπώλυε*).

*All things indeed are pure.*] I.e. all kinds of food are morally clean (v. 14).

*but it is evil for that man who eateth with offence.*] The sense is well expressed by Tyndale's paraphrase "who eateth with hurt of his conscience." If thou cause thy brother to eat against his conscience, it is a sin to him, and so thou art destroying God's work in him for the sake of food. On διὰ προσκόπου πατος "with offence as an attendant circumstance," see note on ii. 27.

21. *It is good neither to eat flesh,*] **Not to eat flesh**, that is to eat no flesh of any kind, and to drink no wine "*is good*" (*καλῶν*), is worthy and noble conduct in one who denies himself rather than offend a brother (1 Cor. viii. 13).

*nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth.*] Read "nor to do anything wherewithal &c." The interpretation answering to the A.V., "*not to eat or drink anything whereby he is grieved*," is too limited. St. Paul extends the maxim to all actions which are in themselves morally indifferent.

*or is offended, or is made weak.*] If these two clauses are retained, we must render the last—"or is weak;" it extends the maxim beyond matters in which a brother is actually led into sin to those in which his conscience is weak, and may easily be grieved. But the genuineness of the clauses is doubtful (they are omitted in Tisch. 8), and to the evidence against them must now be added (r) Freisinger's "Itala Fragmenta."

22. *Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God.*] "Thou hast faith" (Wicifl, Geneva). "*The faith which thou hast, have it,*" &c. (Tisch. 8, with A B C: add r.)

that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth.

23 And he that doubteth is

damned if he eat, because he eateth and putteth a  
not of faith: for whatsoever is not difference  
of faith is sin.

<sup>Or, aīs-</sup>  
<sup>cerneūt</sup>  
The sense is not materially altered by such variations, the same supposition being expressed in different forms. The question is the most lively and natural: compare xiii. 3. St. Paul hears, as it were, how the strong in faith opposes him saying "I have faith, and am convinced that it is allowable for a Christian to eat flesh and drink wine," and replies "thou hast faith? Have it to thyself before God," so that God is the witness of thy faith, and parade it not before men to the offence of the weak" (Meyer, after Chrysostom.)

*Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth.*] Read, "judge not himself in that which he alloweth." The happiness meant is not the future "Messianic blessedness" (Meyer), but the present blessedness of a clear and undoubting conscience. It is a motive to charitable self-restraint addressed to the strong in faith: he who "judges not himself" who is so fully convinced, that he entertains no question or doubt about the rectitude of his conduct "in that which he allows" or approves in his own practice, should be content with this great happiness, and thankfully consent to restrain his freedom for his brother's sake.

23. *And be that doubteth is damned if he eat.*] "But he that doubteth is condemned if he eat." The danger of the weak brother is now brought into striking contrast with the happy condition of him who is strong in faith, and so supplies a further motive to the charitable restraint of freedom.

The use of three kindred words (*κρίνων*, *δικαιώμενος*, *κατακέκριται*) gives to St. Paul's language a pointed force which cannot be preserved in English. For the meaning of *δικαιώμενος* compare iv. 20; Matt. xxi. 21; Mark xi. 23; James i. 6. He that thus doubts, wavers, and debates with himself whether it is or is not lawful to eat, is ipso

facto and at once "condemned if he eat," because he eateth not of faith: compare John iii. 18, "be that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed, &c." St. Paul does not say he is condemned by his own conscience, or he is condemned by God, but "the very act of eating condemns him, of course according to Divine ordering, so that the justice of this sentence is established not only before God, but also before men, and before himself" (Philippi).

*for whatsoever is not of faith is sin.*] "and whatsoever," &c. St. Paul here adds the major premiss of his argument. "Everything that is not of faith is sin": "This eating is not of faith:" "Therefore it is sin, and he is condemned already."

The important axiom, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin," has been very commonly misunderstood, and misapplied in controversial theology, through disregard of its grammar and context.

(1) St. Paul does not say *πᾶν ὃ μὴ ἐκ πιστῶν* "everything except that which positively is of faith;" but *πᾶν ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πιστῶν* "everything which positively is not of faith." In other words the Antecedent to *ὅ* is definite, not indefinite, and the proposition is limited to actions in which there is not a mere absence, but an actual defect of faith.

(2) This grammatical result agrees with the context, which shows that St. Paul is speaking only of actions done by a Christian who does not believe them to be right, but is at least doubtful of their propriety. Chrysostom's comment is admirable: "But all this is spoken by Paul concerning the case that lies before him, not concerning all cases."

On the position of the Doxology, which in a few MSS is placed at the end of this chapter, and on the relation of chapters xv. xvi. to the other portion of the Epistle, see Introduction, § 8.

#### ADDITIONAL NOTE on v. 11.

In Isaiah xlvi. 23, the Vatican MS of the LXX has *καὶ δηεῖται πᾶσα γλώσσα τὸν Θεόν* (Sinait. *τὸν Κύρον*). But the Alexandrine Codex reads *ἔξομολογήσεται τῷ Θεῷ*.

The variation may possibly have been first made by St. Paul in quoting the passage freely here and in Phil. ii. 11, and afterwards

carried back into the text of the LXX, as in the cases mentioned in the note on iii. 12. But the similar variation, *ώμολόγησα* for *ώμοσα*, in Jer. xliv. 26, throws some doubt upon the conjecture that the various readings of the LXX in Isa. xlvi. 23, have been caused by the reflex action of quotation.

## CHAPTER XV.

**I** The strong must bear with the weak. **2** We may not please ourselves, **3** for Christ did not so, **7** but receive one the other, as Christ did us all, **8** both Jews **9** and Gentiles. **15** Paul excuseth his writing, **28** and promiseth to see them, **30** and requesteth their prayers.

**W**E then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves.

**2** Let every one of us please his

neighbour for his good to edification.

**3** For even Christ pleased not himself; but, as it is written, **“The reproaches of them that reproached thee fell on me.”**

**4** For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.

**5** **“Now the God of patience and** <sup>1 Cor. 1.</sup> **comfort**

CHAP. XV.—**1—13. CONCLUSION OF THE EXHORTATION TO MUTUAL LOVE AND FORBEARANCE**

**1. We then that are strong]** Read, “**But we,**” &c. There is the closest connection between this and the last verse of c. xiv.: from the danger of the weak St. Paul naturally passes over ( $\delta\epsilon$ ) to the duty of the strong towards them. It is thoroughly characteristic of St. Paul to associate himself with those on whom he is enforcing a duty, and also to acknowledge fully the advantage of that freedom and strength of faith which he is urging them to exercise with a loving forbearance.

“The infirmities” ( $\alpha\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu\eta\mu\tau\alpha$ ) of the weak are the acts in which their weakness of faith is shown, such as needless scruples or erroneous judgments: these the strong are well able, as they are in duty bound, to bear with loving patience (Gal. vi. 2; Apoc. ii. 2, 3).

**2. Let every one of us please his neighbour]** The duty of bearing the infirmities of the weak requires that we should not do the very opposite, “*please ourselves*,” i.e. indulge our own will and pleasure, in displaying our superior intelligence and freedom, but rather “*let each of us please his neighbour*,” conciliate him by forbearance and loving sympathy (1 Cor. x. 33; Phil. ii. 4).

**for his good to edification.]** “With a view to what is good for edification.” The effort to please must be directed to that which is good for our neighbour, *in relation to building him up in faith.*

*Elē* marks the “aim,” and  $\pi\acute{r}\omega\delta$  the standard of reference (iii. 25, 26).

**3. For even Christ pleased not himself;** **“For Christ also,”** &c. The duty of sacrificing our own pleasure for the good of our brethren is enforced by the one great pattern of self-sacrificing love (2 Cor. viii. 9; Phil. ii. 6).

**but, as it is written, &c.]** Instead of completing his sentence in the narrative style, St. Paul cites the exact words of Scripture, making

Christ Himself the speaker. For a similar mode of quotation, see 1 Cor. i. 31.

The sufferer in the Psalm (lxix. 9) addresses God: “*the reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen upon me.*” It is for God’s sake and to please Him that he suffers.

So in the Messianic interpretation (which St. Paul assumes to be known to his readers) the words are addressed to the Father by Christ, and prove that He pleased not Himself, but endured reproach for the Father’s sake and to do His will.

The passage thus strictly interpreted satisfies the purpose for which St. Paul quotes it, even without bringing in the further consideration that all Christ’s sufferings were endured for the good of His brethren.

**4.** The reason for bringing forward Christ’s example in the words of the Psalmist is that all scriptures of the Old Testament (not its predictions only) were intended to be thus used “*for our learning.*” “*Learning*” is here used in a rare and antiquated sense for “*teaching*” (Wyclif), or “*instruction*” (A. V. 2 Tim. iii. 16).

*that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures, &c.]* Read, “*that through the patience and through the comfort of the Scriptures we,*” &c. “*The patience,*” as well as “*the comfort,*” is that which the Scriptures give: for the Apostle is here stating the purpose for which “*the God of patience and comfort*” (v. 5) caused the Scriptures to be written.

*might have hope.]* I.e. “*our hope*” ( $\tau\eta\pi\acute{r}\omega\delta$ ), the Christian’s “*hope of the glory of God*” (v. 2). The purpose of the Scriptures is to promote the present possession of this blessed hope through the patience and consolation which they impart to those who endure suffering for God’s sake.

Compare v. 4 for the connection between “*patience*” and “*hope.*”

**5. Now the God of patience and consolation]** **“And may the God of patience and comfort.”**

<sup>Or, after  
the ex-  
ample of.</sup> consolation grant you to be like-minded one toward another according to Christ Jesus:

6 That ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

7 Wherefore receive ye one ano-

Compare 2 Cor. i. 3, "God of all comfort." The Greek word (*παράκλησις*) is the same as in v. 4.

*to be likeminded one toward another,]* "To be of the same mind one with another:" *ἐν ἀλλήλοις*, not *εἰς ἀλλήλους*, as in xii. 16.

What the Apostle prays for is not identity of opinion, but harmony of feeling: "idem sentire, idem velle."

*according to Christ Jesus.]* Compare Phil. ii. 2, in connexion with the following verses, especially v. 5, "Let the same mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus." Let each be so conformed to Christ, that all may be of one mind among yourselves: "ut unus quasi animus fiat ex pluribus." (Cic. de Amic. c. 25.)

6. *That ye may with one mind and one mouth,*] "That of one mind with one mouth ye may," i.e. that being of one accord (*ὁμοθυμαδόν*) you may unite in one utterance of praise.

*God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.]* There is no theological objection to the proposed rendering, "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," which is fully justified by Eph. i. 17, "The God of our Lord Jesus Christ," and by John xx. 17. "He is His God, because of Him He was begotten God" (Hil. de Trin. iv. 35, p. 96, Ellicott). Grammatical considerations are equally indecisive; but there is much weight in Bishop Ellicott's remark on Gal. i. 4: "As the term *πατήρ* conveys necessarily a relative idea, which in theological language admits of various applications (see Suicer, 'Thes.' s. v *πατήρ*), while Θεός conveys only one absolute idea, it would not seem improbable that the connexion of thought in the mind of the inspired writer might lead him in some passages to add a defining genitive to *πατήρ*, which he did not intend necessarily to be referred to Θεός."

For this reason, and because Eph. i. 17 is the only passage in which St. Paul directly and unquestionably calls God "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ," it is better to retain the rendering of the Authorised Version, with the omission of "even."

7. *Wherefore receive ye one another,*] This exhortation is an immediate inference from

ther, as Christ also received us to the glory of God.

8 Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers:

9 And that the Gentiles might

the preceding prayer for concord, and also a general conclusion of the whole argument beginning with xiv. 1. The appeal there made to one party, "Him that is weak in faith receive ye," is here extended to both, "receive ye one another," in accordance with the arguments addressed to both parties in xiv. 3-13.

*as Christ also received us]* For "us" read "you," which agrees better with what goes before in vv. 5-7.

*to the glory of God.]* Not "receive ye one another . . . to the glory of God" (Chrysost. &c.); but, "as Christ received you to the glory of God," i.e. received you both Jews and Gentiles into His Church that God might be thereby glorified. Compare Eph. i. 12-14; Phil. ii. 11.

The interpretation proposed by Grotius—"received you into the glory of God," i.e., into the inheritance of the future glory of the children of God—is not admissible; it would have required the Article to be expressed (*εἰς τὴν δόξαν τ. Θ.*), and it does not agree with the explanation, which St. Paul himself adds in vv. 8, 9, of what he meant by the words "Christ received you to the glory of God."

8. *Now I say]* "For I say."

The reading followed in A. V. (λέγω δέ) would have its usual sense, "But what I mean is this" (Gal. iv. 1; 1 Cor. i. 12). But λέγω γάρ is better attested and introduces more fitly the explanatory proof of the statement "Christ received you to the glory of God."

That this statement, and the proof of it, are addressed more especially, though not exclusively, to the strong in faith, is evident both from the repetition of the phrase used in xiv. 1 (*προσλαμβάνεσθε*), and also from the great prominence given in the following context to the reception of the Gentiles, to whom "the strong" for the most part belonged.

*that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision.]* "The whole passage should be thus rendered: "For I say, that Christ hath been made a minister of circumcision for God's truth, in order that he might confirm the promises made unto the fathers, and that the Gentiles might glorify God for mercy."

<sup>Ps. 18.</sup> glorify God for *his* mercy; as it is written, <sup>1</sup>For this cause I will confess to thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto thy name.

<sup>Deut. 32.</sup> 10 And again he saith, <sup>2</sup>Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people.

<sup>Ps. 117.</sup> 11 And again, <sup>2</sup>Praise the Lord,

all ye Gentiles; and laud him, all ye people.

12 And again, Esaias saith, <sup>4</sup>There <sup>Is. 11. 10.</sup> shall be a root of Jesse, and he that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles; in him shall the Gentiles trust.

13 Now the God of hope fill you

Circumcision was the condition attached to the promises. He therefore who was to be the seed of Abraham and the fountain of blessing to all nations, must be a "minister of circumcision." He must fulfil the covenant of circumcision both in His person and in His work: He must be "*born under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we*" (Gentiles as well as Jews) "*might receive the adoption of sons*" (Gal. iv. 4, 5). Compare for the construction, 2 Cor. iii. 6, διακόνους κανῆ διαθήκης, xi. 15, Gal. ii. 17.

The words διάκονον πεπιστοῦ have been incorrectly interpreted in various ways:

(1.) "A minister of the true circumcision of the heart: ii. 28, 29" (Origen). There is nothing in the context to indicate this special sense of circumcision.

(2.) "A minister of circumcised persons," i.e. of the Jews, "that they might be brought within the promises, that God might be found true to them" (Cyril). "For to devote His activity to the welfare of the Jewish nation was, according to promise, the duty of His Messianic office. Comp. Matt. xx. 28; xv. 24" (Meyer). This interpretation is not absolutely inconsistent with the absence of the Article (iii. 30), which we should, however, have expected (Gal. ii. 8) but is clearly inadequate. "*The promises made unto the fathers*" were not that Christ should minister exclusively to the Jews, but that in the seed of Abraham all the nations of the earth should be blessed.

*for the truth of God.*] This is immediately explained in the appended clause: "*to confirm*" (rather, "*in order that he might confirm*") (*the truth of*) *the promises made unto the fathers.*" Compare 2 Cor. i. 20.

9. *And that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy;*] The A. V. here follows the only admissible construction: the objections urged against it by Alford and others arise from not observing the double antithesis, between ἵπερ δλῆθεις and ἵπερ ἐλέος, and between βεβαιωταί τας ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων and τὰ δὲ έθνη κ.τ.λ.

In the latter case the antithetical sense is more distinctly marked by bringing the contrasted clauses under the same grammatical construction.

Observe also that the main stress of the

passage lies on the latter half of the antithesis. St. Paul is appealing more especially to "the strong," i.e. to the Gentiles, and in order to move them to greater forbearance and goodwill towards their weaker Jewish brethren, he shows that Christ Himself became in all things a Jew to fulfil God's promises to the Jews, and thereby to extend His mercy to the Gentiles. Even for Gentiles "Salvation is of the Jews," not secured by covenant, but granted of free mercy.

*For this cause I will confess to thee among the Gentiles.]* See note on Ps. xviii. 49. David having been delivered from all his enemies, and raised to dominion over the neighbouring nations gives "the first utterance of a hope, which in later times became clear and distinct, that the heathen should learn to fear and worship Jehovah" (Perowne). In St. Paul's Messianic interpretation, Christ the antitype of David, foretelling the conquests of His kingdom, declares that in the midst of the Gentiles He will give thanks to God for their conversion.

*Ἐξομολογεῖσθαι*, has here its usual sense in the LXX, that of giving thanks or praise.

10. *Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people.]* Deut. xxxii. 43, where see note.

St. Paul follows the LXX. Either of the alternative renderings would be equally suitable to his purpose: "Praise his people, ye nations," or, "Rejoice, ye Gentiles, ye who are His people."

11. *Praise the Lord, all ye Gentiles; and laud him, all ye people.]* Ps. cxvii. 1. Both clauses are addressed to Gentile nations: in the latter there is a various reading, "let all the nations praise him" (Tisch.). From the other verse of the same short Psalm St. Paul may have drawn his antithesis of "mercy" and "truth" in vv. 8, 9.

12. *There shall be a root of Jesse, and he that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles; in him shall the Gentiles trust.]* Read, "There shall be the root of Jesse, and he that ariseth to rule over Gentiles; on him shall Gentiles hope." See notes on Isa. xi. 10. St. Paul follows the LXX, as his argument requires nothing more than the general sense that the Messiah of the Jews should be the desire and hope of the Gentiles.

13. *Now the God of hope fill you]* "And

with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost.

14 And I myself also am persuaded of you, my brethren, that ye also are full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish one another.

*may the God of hope,*" &c. From the last quoted word "hope," St. Paul forms a title "*the God of hope,*" by which he may invoke (as in vv. 4, 5) an appropriate blessing on those to whom his previous exhortation has been addressed. "*All joy and peace*" have their root in the "*hope*" of eternal life, their element or vital atmosphere "*in believing,*" their fruit in the increasing abundance of their hope growing "*in the power of the Holy Ghost.*"

#### 14—33. OCCASION OF THE EPISTLE.

In v. 14 the Apostle passes on ( $\delta\epsilon$ ) from exhortation to an explanation of his own motives and intentions.

14. *And I myself also]* This is explained as meaning: "*I myself also,*" independently of the general good opinion which others have of you, i. 8" (Meyer). But there is nothing in the context to suggest this meaning, and the reference to so remote a passage as i. 8 is quite inadmissible. Chrysostom's interpretation is far better: "**Now even I myself**" who so admonish and reprove you.

*that ye also are full of goodness,*] Read, "*that even of yourselves ye are full of goodness,*" i. e. even without being exhorted. *Ἄγαδορίνη*, a Biblical word, does not mean (as Meyer says) "*excellence generally (that you also of yourselves are very excellent people),*" but it means "*goodness*" in the more special sense as a *disposition to do good*. (Compare Trench, N. T. Synon. 2nd Series, and Ellicott and Lightfoot on Gal. v. 22.)

*filled with all knowledge,*] From 1 Cor. viii. 1, 7, 10, 11, we see that St. Paul refers to the knowledge of spiritual truth which was professed by the strong in faith. There St. Paul points to a contrast, "*Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth*": here he ascribes to his readers a happy combination of *goodness and knowledge*.

*able also to admonish one another.]* "*able even to admonish one another,*" without need of being admonished by me.

15. *Nevertheless, brethren, I have written the more boldly unto you in some sort.]* "**But I have written more boldly unto you in part.**" Parts of the Epistle, such as vi. 12-21

15 Nevertheless, brethren, I have written the more boldly unto you in some sort, as putting you in mind, because of the grace that is given to me of God,

16 That I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the

xii. 17, ff., xiii. 3, xiii. 3 ff., 13, 14, and especially c. xiv. throughout, are written more boldly than a belief in their goodness and knowledge might seem to require. That the boldness lay not in the fact of writing at all to a Church which he had not visited, but in the mode of writing, is clear from *ἀπὸ μέρους*, which limits the bolder writing to parts of the Epistle. The order of the words forbids the connexion, "in some sort more boldly."

*as putting you in mind,] "as putting you in remembrance again,"* not as teaching you things of which you might be ignorant. The word *ἐπαναμνήσκω* is used with a delicate courtesy, as in Demosth. 74, Plat. Legg. iii. p. 688 A. Compare also 2 Pet. i. 12.

*because of the grace that is given to me of God.]* Read rather "*the grace given,*" or "*the grace that was given:*" compare i. 5, xii. 3. The obligation of the Apostolic office is thus alleged as a reason for his boldness in putting them in remembrance of Christian duties.

"He comes down from the teacher's chair and converses as with brethren and friends and equals, a part which best becomes the teacher, to vary his discourse according to the profit of his hearers. See for example, how, after saying '*I wrote more boldly,*' and '*in part,*' and '*as putting you again in remembrance,*' he is not satisfied even with this, but adds with still greater humility of speech, '*because of the grace given unto me of God;*' as he also said in the beginning, '*I am a debtor:*' as if he had said, '*I did not snatch the honour for myself, nor rush upon it first, but God laid this upon me, and that by way of grace, not as setting apart a worthy person to this office.*' Be not therefore offended, for it is not I that rise up against you, but God that has laid this upon me.'" (Chrysostom.)

16. *That I should be the minister of Jesus Christ]* "*In order that I should be a minister of Christ Jesus.*" The special purpose for which the grace was given by God. *Λειτουργός*, "*minister*" and its derivatives are used in the LXX and N. T., both of ministering in general, and of ministering in things sacred. For the general sense, see

<sup>Or, sacri-</sup> <sup>1</sup> offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost.

17 I have therefore whereof I

may glory through Jesus Christ in those things which pertain to God.

18 For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ

Josh. i. 1, 2 Sam. xiii. 18 (Amnon's servant), 1 Kings x. 5, 2 Chron. ix. 4 (Solomon's ministers), 2 Kings iv. 43, vi. 15 (Elisha's servitor), Ps. ciii. 21, civ. 4, Phil. ii. 25, 30, &c., and note on c. xiii. 6. The special sense is very frequent in the LXX, and applies equally to the ministrations of Priests and Levites (Ex. xxxviii. 21; Num. i. 50, iii. 6, viii. 22; Neh. x. 39, &c.).

In the N. T. besides this proper application to the ministry of the Tabernacle (Luke i. 23; Heb. ix. 21, x. 11) we find also a metaphorical application to Christ (Heb. viii. 2, 6), to Christian ministers (Acts xiii. 2), and to all Christians (Phil. ii. 17, Lightfoot). In the present passage it is clear from what follows that St. Paul applies the term to himself as a minister of the Gospel appointed by Christ the Head of the Church.

*to the Gentiles,*] “in reference to the Gentiles.” The Apostle represents himself as the ministering Priest, the preaching of the Gospel as his priestly function, and the believing Gentiles as his offering. In this connexion therefore *εἰς τὰ ἔθνη* cannot mean a “minister to the Gentiles,” nor “a minister sent unto the Gentiles,” but “a minister in reference to the Gentiles,” whom he offers to God.

*ministering the gospel of God,*] Compare 4 Macc. vii. 8, *τοὺς ἱερουργοῦντας τὸν νόμον ἀδιόρθωτοι.* “The preaching of the Gospel he calls a sacrificial work (*ἱερουργίαν*), and genuine faith an acceptable offering” (Theodore). “This is my priesthood, to preach and to proclaim” (Chrysostom).

*that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable,*] Read “*that the offering of the Gentiles*” &c., i. e. “that the Gentiles might be an acceptable offering” (Tyndale).

The Apostle's thought and expression are both taken from Isai. lxvi. 19, 20: “*And they shall declare my glory among the Gentiles. And they shall bring all your brethren for an offering unto the Lord out of all nations.*”

“And none would blame a priest for being zealous to offer his sacrifice without spot. But this he said, both to wing their thoughts and show them that they were a sacrifice, and at the same time as an excuse for himself, that this duty had been laid upon him. For my sacrificing sword, he says, is the Gospel, the word preached: and the cause is not that I may be glorified, but ‘*that the offering of the Gentiles may be acceptable.*’ For God has brought it to this, not so much

honouring me as caring for you. And how can it be made acceptable? “*In the Holy Ghost:*” for not faith only is needed, but also a spiritual mode of life, that we may hold fast the Spirit that was once given. For not wood and fire, nor altar and knife, but the Spirit is everything with us” (Chrysostom).

17. *I have therefore whereof I may glory through Jesus Christ]* “I have my glorying therefore in Christ Jesus”: it follows from the nature of my ministry (ver. 16) that I have a right to glory; but my glorying is not in myself, but “in Christ Jesus,” because as His minister I do all things in and through Him (1 Cor. xv. 31).

*in those things which pertain to God,*] “in things pertaining to God”: see Heb. ii. 17; v. 1, where the context refers to the duties of the Priest's office before God. St. Paul thus limits his glorying to the ministrations of the Gospel regarded as an offering made before the Lord.

18. *For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me,*] This is Tyndale's version and very accurate, but the meaning may be made clearer by a paraphrase: “For I will not dare to speak of anything except what has been wrought by Christ through me.” The Apostle thus explains and confirms the limit assigned to his glorying in v. 17 as a “glorying in Christ Jesus.” “I will glory,” he means, only of what has been accomplished not by me but by Christ through me.

According to M. Godet, “the only possible sense of the words *I will not dare to speak*, is this: It would be a rashness on my part to name a single sign of Apostleship by which God has not deigned to ratify my ministry among the Gentiles.” That is to say, every possible sign of Apostolic power has been granted to my ministry. But surely the words “*I will not dare to speak*,” are very ill-fitted to express what M. Godet calls “the paroxysm of that glorying of which he spake in v. 17.”

*to make the Gentiles obedient,*] Compare i. 5. The “obedience of Gentiles” to faith in Christ is what has been described above in figurative language as “*the offering of the Gentiles.*” The Apostle thus explains the second limitation of his glorying to “things pertaining to God” (v. 17), i. e. to his priestlike ministration of the Gospel.

*by word and deed,*] The means by which

hath not wrought by me, to make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed,

19 Through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God; so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I

Christ wrought through His minister are here briefly stated under the very usual antithesis of "word and deed."

By "word" St. Paul means the Gospel which he preached, by "deed" or "work" (*τέρπω*) all that he had been enabled to do and to suffer in his ministry.

19. *Through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God;*] Read, "In power of signs and wonders, in power of the Spirit of God."

"Signs and wonders" were not all that Christ wrought by "deed" through St. Paul, and the "power of the Spirit of God" was exerted through him not only "by word," but in many other ways. Thus the purpose of the two parallel clauses is not so much to explain more fully what is meant by "word and deed," as to glorify the Divine power with which Christ wrought through the ministry of His Apostle.

The "power of signs and wonders" is not the "power of working miracles," but the power which miracles have as "signs" to convince, and as "wonders" to overawe, by the proof of a superhuman agency. St. Paul appeals to his miracles as "signs of an Apostle" in 2 Cor. xii. 12: compare Acts xiv. 3, xv. 12, and xix. 11.

By the "power of the Spirit of God" is meant "that extraordinary influence of the Spirit, which in a moment turned men from darkness to light." (Jowett.)

so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum,] Tyndale's translation is more correct: *so that from Jerusalem and the coasts round about unto Illyricum.* The result of Christ's working through His Apostle is here stated as if the preceding sentence had been affirmative in form, as well as in sense.

How does this statement, that Jerusalem was the starting-point of St. Paul's ministry, agree with his own representation in Gal. i. 17? (Lucht, 'On the last two chapters of Romans.') St. Paul is here describing *not the duration*: it reached, he says, "from Jerusalem" as far as "unto Illyricum."

Damascus, the scene of his earliest preaching (Acts ix. 20), lies between these extreme limits, and so near to Jerusalem as to be fairly included in the parts "round about" it.

The more distant Arabia was not the scene

have fully preached the gospel of Christ.

20 Yea, so have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation:

of the Apostle's ministry, but only of his retirement (Gal. i. 17: see Lightfoot).

It was natural, we may add, for St. Paul to fix the starting-point of his ministry at the Holy City, from which the Gospel first went forth into the world, and where he had himself first joined the fellowship of the Apostles, and in friendly intercourse with Peter and James and Barnabas "spake boldly in the name of the Lord" (Acts ix. 28: see also Lightf. Gal. p. 88).

Chrysostom's interpretation, that St. Paul had travelled from Jerusalem *in a circle* round to Illyricum, including Persia, Armenia, &c., has no support in this passage or elsewhere.

The great road from the East to Rome, passing through Macedonia into Illyricum, reached the Adriatic coast at Dyrrachium. This Southern or Greek Illyricum was incorporated by the Romans with Macedonia, and therefore may well have been visited by St. Paul during the journey mentioned in Acts xx. 1, 2. In Illyricum, whatever extent we here assign to the region so named, St. Paul reached the Western limit of his missionary journeys, and was comparatively near to Rome. (See Conyb. and Howson, ii. 126.)

I have fully preached the gospel of Christ.] Compare Col. i. 25. The expression must be understood, as we see from the next verse, with reference to the special office of the Apostle to the Gentiles and his usual practice, namely, to preach the Gospel in the chief cities of each country that he visited, and to lay foundations on which others might build (1 Cor. iii. 10). This St. Paul could truly say that he had done from Jerusalem unto Illyricum.

20. *Yea, so have I strived to preach the gospel;*] "Making it however my ambition to preach the Gospel on this wise."

The better reading makes this a participial clause, dependent on the preceding sentence, and containing an important limitation of its meaning.

For the meaning of φιλοτιμεῖσθαι see 2 Cor. v. 9, and 1 Thess. iv. 11.

The mode of preaching (*οὐτῶς εἴαγγ.*) is explained negatively in this verse, and positively in the next.

not where Christ was named.] *i.e.* not where men had already been taught to believe

<sup>\*Is. 52. 15.</sup> 21 But as it is written, 'To whom he was not spoken of, they shall see : and they that have not heard shall understand.'

22 For which cause also I have been <sup>I or,  
many  
ways, or,  
often-  
times.</sup> much hindered from coming to you.

23 But now having no more place in these parts, and having a great desire these many years to come unto you ;

in Christ, and call upon His name in public confession and adoration: compare Eph. i. 21, 2 Tim. ii. 19, Is. xxvi. 13, Amos vi. 10.

*lest I should build, &c.]* In 2 Cor. x. 12–16 the same principle is asserted with the strong emotion roused by the ungenerous conduct of his adversaries.

Baur's objection to the genuineness of this passage ('Paulus,' i. p. 357) is based on a misrepresentation of its meaning. For it is evident that St. Paul refers to the *oral preaching* of the Gospel, as requiring his personal presence hitherto in the East. His letters to the Colossians and Laodicæans (Col. iv. 16), are sufficient proof that in writing to the Church at Rome, he was not transgressing his rule to avoid building on another man's foundation.

21. *But as it is written,*] Isaiah lii. 15, quoted exactly from the LXX. According to the Hebrew, nations and kings shall be astonished at the exaltation of the suffering Servant of God, as a thing unheard and unknown. In the LXX the change in the form of the sentence does not materially affect the sense in which St. Paul uses the passage, namely to show that his practice of preaching where Christ's name was unknown agreed with the general character of the Gospel message as foretold by Isaiah. According to Fritzsche, St. Paul believed that Isaiah pointed especially to him and his ministry, predicting that Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles should carry the announcement of the Messiah to those Gentiles who had not yet heard of Him from other Apostles. But this is a mere travesty of St. Paul's meaning, invented by one who himself rejects the Messianic interpretation of Isaiah lii., liii. altogether. See notes on Isaiah.

22. *I have been much hindered*] "I was the most times hindered." There were other hindrances, but the most frequent arose from the duty of preaching the Gospel in places where Christ's name was not known.

23. *But now having no more place in these parts,*] "But now no longer having place," i.e. 'since no longer (*ὑπέκειται*) I have room.' In these regions, from Jerusalem to Illyricum, the Gospel message has been

24 Whosoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to you : for I trust to see you in my journey, and to be brought on my way thitherward by you, if first I be somewhat filled <sup>I Gr. with  
you, ver.</sup> with your company.

25 But now I go unto Jerusalem <sup>32.</sup> to minister unto the saints.

26 For it hath pleased them of

fully preached (v. 19), and Churches have been founded, so that there is no longer room for doing that which is the peculiar work of an Apostle, especially of the one "Apostle of the Gentiles."

*a great desire]* "a longing" (*ἐπιθυμίαν*): compare i. 11; 1 Thess. iii. 6; 2 Cor. vii. 7, 11; Philipp. i. 8; with Bp. Lightfoot's note.

24. *Whosoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to you : for I trust to see you in my journey,*] Read, "Whosoever I take my journey into Spain :—for I hope to see you as I pass through." The words "I will come to you" were added to complete the broken sentence, the conclusion of which is found only in an altered form in v. 28.

Meyer omits γάρ also: "Whosoever I take my journey into Spain, I hope to see you as I pass through." This makes all smooth and regular, but is against the evidence, and the broken sentence is quite in St. Paul's style.

On the intended journey to Spain see Introduction, § 6.

The visit to Rome was intended to be only in passing through, because the Christian Faith was already established there (Bengel).

*and to be brought on my way thitherward]* "and to be sent forward thither." St. Paul hoped to receive from Rome the same kindness and respect as from other Churches, which sent companions to escort him on his further journeys: Acts xv. 3; 1 Cor. xvi. 6; 2 Cor. i. 16.

*if first I be somewhat filled with your company.]* "If I may first be in part satisfied with your company," or "after that I have somewhat enjoyed you" (Tyndale), "enjoyed your acquaintance" (Cranmer). Compare i. 12 for an explanation of the nature of the satisfaction which St. Paul hoped for.

St. Paul says courteously "*in part satisfied*," meaning "not as much as I might wish, but as much as circumstances shall permit" (Grotius).

25. *But now I go unto Jerusalem to minister unto the saints.*] "But now I am setting

Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem.

27 It hath pleased them verily; and their debtors they are. For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things, their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things.

**out unto Jerusalem, ministering to the saints.**" In contrast to the hope of a future visit to Rome the Apostle's present and immediate duty is taking him away in the opposite direction. See Acts xx. 3, and note on i. 9.

"ministering." The Present Participle implies that the journey in charge of the collected alms of the Churches was itself a part of the ministration to the poor saints at Jerusalem: see 1 Cor. xvi. 4, 15; 2 Cor. ix. 1; and Introduction, § 2.

26. *For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to have been pleased.*] "For Macedonia and Achaia have been pleased." Cp. Luke xii. 32; 1 Thess. ii. 8. The word (*νῦδικηραν*) expresses the benevolent pleasure of a cheerful giver.

*to make a certain contribution for the poor saints.*] Read, "*to make some contribution for the poor among the saints.*" See note on xii. 13. "The contributor enters into fellowship with the person aided, inasmuch as he 'shares his necessities': *κοινωνία* is hence the characteristic expression for *almsgiving*, without however having changed its proper sense *communion* into the active one of *communication*" (Meyer).

The indefinite word "*some*" corresponds to the fact that the contribution might be more or less according to the ability and good will of the givers (1 Cor. xvi. 2; 2 Cor. ix. 7).

27. *It hath pleased them verily; and their debtors they are.*] "They have been pleased, I say, and are their debtors." The γάρ not only resumes the previous statement, but confirms it by a further explanation.

*For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things.*] "For if the Gentiles shared in their spiritual things." The Gospel, with all its spiritual blessings, which are the gifts of the Holy Ghost, was at first the possession of the Mother Church in Jerusalem, and from thence was communicated to the Gentiles. In return for these greater gifts the Gentiles owe a debt (*ὑπειλόντων*) to the saints at Jerusalem "*to minister unto them in carnal things*," i.e. in things

28 When therefore I have performed this, and have sealed to them this fruit, I will come by you into Spain.

29 And I am sure that, when I come unto you, I shall come in the fulness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ.

30 Now I beseech you, brethren,

which belong to man's bodily life, such as food and raiment. For this sense of "*carnal*" things as contrasted with spiritual, see 1 Cor. ix. 11. Observe that St. Paul applies to this "*ministry of the body*" the same honourable title *λειτουργία* which he has used above of preaching the Gospel (v. 16).

Observe also in proof of the Pauline authorship of this chapter (most unreasonably questioned by Baur) the delicate and *unobtrusive coincidence* with Gal. ii. 10.

28. *and have sealed to them this fruit.*] Compare Phil. iv. 17; the contribution (*κοινωνία*, v. 26) is as fruit brought forth by the Gentile Churches. By going himself with those who conveyed it, St. Paul would assure and certify to the saints at Jerusalem the faithful delivery of the gift by the seal, as it were, of Apostolic authority, more especially because the pillars of the Church at Jerusalem had expressly laid on him the duty of remembering the poor (Gal. ii. 10).

I will come by you into Spain.] Read, "*I will come back*," &c., Plato 'Symp.' 193, c.

29. *And I am sure that, when I come unto you, I shall come in the fulness of the blessing, &c.*] "*And I know that in coming to you, I shall come*," &c. There is an emphasis on the pronoun. Thus the repetition of the word "*come*" is no empty tautology: the reason of the Apostles' confidence lies in the character of those to whom he is coming: he knows that in them there will be nothing to diminish the fulness of the blessing which he brings. Compare i. 8, 12. So in 1 Cor. ii. 1, "*And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom*," the reason of the simplicity of the Apostle's preaching lay in the self-sufficiency of those to whom he came, and in their conceit of superior wisdom.

*the blessing of the gospel of Christ.*] Read, "*the blessing of Christ*."

Godet rightly asks, "Would a forger writing under the name of the Apostle in the 2nd century, have drawn a picture of the future so opposite to the way in which things really came to pass?"

30. *Now I beseech you, brethren, for the*

for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God for me;

31 That I may be delivered from them that do not believe in Judæa; and that my service which I have for

<sup>Or, are</sup>  
disobedient.

*Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God for me.]* Read, "And I beseech you, brethren, by our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the love of the Spirit, to strive together with me in your prayers for me to God" (Five Clergymen). This urgent request for his brethren's prayers springs from the same confidence in their faith, which has been already shown in v. 29. Thus δέ is simply continuative, "And," not adversative, "But."

"by our Lord Jesus Christ." Compare xii. 1, "by the mercies of God." Christ is the motive by which the Apostle beseeches his brethren, 2 Cor. x. 1.

"the love of the Spirit" is the love which is "the fruit of the Spirit," Gal. v. 22; as to the mode in which the Spirit produces this love towards God and man, see note on v. 5.

*to strive.]* "Fervent prayer is a striving of the inner man against the hostile or dangerous powers which it is sought to avert or overcome, and for the aims which it is sought to attain" (Meyer).

31. *that do not believe.]* "that are disobedient" (Margin, after Geneva). See note on xi. 30.

Already on the eve of his departure from Corinth St. Paul feels the same anxious forebodings of what should befall him at Jerusalem, which he expressed so strongly during his journey thither, Acts xx. 22, 23; xxi. 13. Thus the Lord was fulfilling the promise made through Ananias to Saul at the time of his conversion, "I will shew him how great things be must suffer for my name's sake" (Acts ix. 16).

*and that my service which I have for Jerusalem may be accepted of the saints.]* "and that my ministration which is for Jerusalem may prove acceptable to the saints" (Five Clergymen). See 2 Cor. viii. 4; ix. 1. In this anxiety concerning his re-

Jerusalem may be accepted of the saints;

32 That I may come unto you with joy by the will of God, and may with you be refreshed.

33 Now the God of peace be with you all. Amen.

ception by the Jewish Church we see another undesigned yet strong proof that the epistle was written by the Apostle whose mission to the Gentiles was so invidiously regarded at Jerusalem. Compare Acts xxi. 21.

The various reading (*δωροφορία*) "bringing a gift" instead of "ministration" (*πακορία*), though found in the Vatican and a few other MSS, is probably an explanatory gloss.

32. *That I may come unto you with joy by the will of God, and may with you be refreshed.]* Or, "That having come unto you in joy by the will of God, I may with you find rest." (The reading *ελθών* adopted by Tisch. 8 with N \* A C does not affect the sense.)

"in joy." Compare 1 Cor. iv. 21; 2 Cor. ii. 1.

*by the will of God.]* The necessity of this submission of the Apostle's will to the will of God was shown in the result: he came to Rome, but not "in joy," nor to "find rest." Compare i. 10, 12.

The Vatican MS. reads "by the will of the Lord Jesus," and other MSS have "Christ Jesus" or "Jesus Christ." It has been observed that St. Paul's constant expression is, *by the will of God* (1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; viii. 5; Eph. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1; Rom. i. 10; Gal. i. 4). He has never written "according to the will of Christ," or any similar phrase (Tisch. 8). In Eph. v. 17, "*the will of the Lord*" is Christ's moral will; the will which directs the dispensations of Divine Providence is called "*the will of God*."

33. *Now the God of peace be with you all.]* "And the God of peace," &c. This concluding prayer arises so naturally out of the preceding thoughts, that it is quite unnecessary to assume that the Apostle's mind returns to the dissensions among the Christians at Rome (xiv.). Compare 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. iv. 9; 1 Thess. v. 23.

## CHAPTER XVI.

**3 Paul willeth the brethren to greet many,**  
*17 and adviseth them to take heed of those*  
*which cause dissension and offences, 21 and*  
*after sundry salutations endeth with praise*  
*and thanks to God.*

**I COMMEND unto you Phebe**  
*our sister, which is a servant of*  
*the church which is at Cenchrea :*

## CHAP. XVI.—PERSONAL MESSAGES, BENE-DICTIONS, AND DOXOLOGY.

## 1, 2. COMMENDATION OF PHŒBE.

**1. I commend.]** “Now I commend”: comp. 2 Cor. iii. 1; v. 12; &c.; Xen. Mem. I. vi. 14; Anab. III. i. 8. That Phœbe was the bearer of the Epistle, is very probable; it is clear from v. 2, that the occasion of her journey was some business in which she might require the help which this introduction was intended to secure for her.

*our sister.]* *I.e.* my sister in Christ and yours also: compare v. 23 ἀδελφός.

*which is a servant of the church which is at Cenchrea.]* Second and more special ground of commendation. The Feminine διάκονος (Demosth. 762, 4) occurs only here in the N. T. The proposed rendering “deaconess” (Five Clergymen), is open to the objection that it introduces into the N. T. the technical name (διάκονος) which is of later origin. The office was, no doubt, the same, namely, that of ministering to the sick, the poor, and the stranger. Even after the introduction of the technical name, the more general form (διάκονος) remained in use, as in Ignatius ‘ad Antiochenos’ p. 96; Theodoret also, in the 5th century, calls a deaconess διάκονος. See Suicer’s Thesaurus.”

Cenchrea, or more correctly “Cenohroæ,” was the eastern part of Corinth on the Saronic Gulf; distant about nine miles from the city. It was important as a fortress commanding one of the passes over the Isthmus, and as having an excellent harbour, which made it the emporium of trade with the East. The Church there was probably founded and organised by St. Paul himself.

**2. as becometh saints.]** “in a manner worthy of saints,” *i.e.* with such kindness and hospitality as “saints,” or Christian believers, ought to show to a sister in the Lord.

*and that ye assist her.]* Lit. “stand by her,” as in 2 Tim. iv. 17. Both words (παρίστασθαι and πάργυμα) often refer to legal proceedings, and occur together in this sense Demosth. 1120, 26. It is probable therefore

**2 That ye receive her in the**  
**Lord, as becometh saints, and that**  
**ye assist her in whatsoever business**  
**she hath need of you: for she hath**  
**been a succourer of many, and of**  
**myself also.**

**3 Greet Priscilla and Aquila my**  
*helpers in Christ Jesus:*

**4 Who have for my life laid down**

that Phœbe was going to Rome on legal “business.” On the conjecture that Phœbe’s destination was Ephesus, not Rome, see Introduction, § 8.

*for she bath been a succourer of many.]*  
*“for she herself also.”* The legal representative of a foreigner or provincial was called in Latin “patronus,” in Greek πορτάρης. In allusion to the latter name and to the word παρασῆτε, St. Paul calls Phœbe a πορτάρις, *i.e.* a “protectress” or “helper” of many and of himself among them. Wielif preserves the play on words, “and that ye help her in whatever cause she shall need of you, for she helped many.”

*and of myself also]* It is not improbable that Phœbe may have rendered service to St. Paul at Cenchrea on the occasion mentioned in Acts xviii. 18. His vow seems to point to a deliverance from danger or sickness.

## 3-16. APOSTOLIC GREETINGS.

On this whole section in its relation to the rest of the Epistle, see Introduction, § 8.

**3. Greet Priscilla.]** “Prisca.” See note on Acts xviii. 2. On the objection that Aquila and Priscilla were not likely to have been at Rome at the time when St. Paul wrote to that Church, see Introduction, § 8.

*my helpers in Christ Jesus.]* “My fellow-workers,” &c. “Labour for the Gospel lives and moves in Christ as its very element” (Meyer). For the fact see Acts xviii. 26; 1 Cor. xvi. 19. They were also fellow-workers in the trade of tent-making (Acts xviii. 2).

**4. Who have for my life laid down their own necks.]** Omit “have.” The fact thus stated as a special reason for greeting them (οἵτινες, “quippe qui”) is otherwise unknown, and the exact meaning of the statement is therefore somewhat obscure to us, though it must have been clear to the readers. In the assault of the Jews at Corinth (Acts xviii. 6-18), and again in the tumult at Ephesus (Acts xix.), Aquila and Priscilla were with St. Paul, but are not specially mentioned as incurring any danger for his

their own necks: unto whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles.

5 Likewise *greet* the church that is in their house. Salute my well-beloved Epænetus, who is the first-fruits of Achaia unto Christ.

6 Greet Mary, who bestowed much labour on us.

sake. Such occasions were frequent in the adventurous life of the Apostle.

*laid down their own necks.]* Read, “*neck*.” The Singular implies that the expression is figurative, as does the converse use of the Plural *μηρέπας* in Mark x. 30, if the reading be retained. The most likely meaning therefore is that Aquila and Priscilla risked their lives, not that they literally put down their necks under the executioner’s sword, nor that they pledged (*ιπέθηκαν*) their lives to the magistrate for the safe custody of Paul.

*unto whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles.]* St. Paul speaks with emotion as of an event comparatively recent: yet sufficient time had elapsed for the matter to have become generally known among the Gentiles. These two circumstances correspond well with the supposition that the event had occurred at Ephesus in the tumult, and that St. Paul had recently heard of the arrival of his friends at Rome. It would be natural that he should thus commend them to his readers on the first opportunity, and should mention the thanksgiving of the Gentile Churches, which he had since been visiting.

5. *Likewise greet the church that is in their house.]* See Acts xii. 12; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Col. iv. 15; Philem. 2. “The Church in the house” was not merely the Christian household itself, but a body of believers meeting for worship in the house of some leading member of the community.

It appears from the “Martyrdom of Justin,” § 3, that as late at least as the middle of the 2nd century there was no fixed place of general assembly for the whole Church at Rome, but several small assemblies like this Church in the house of Aquila and Priscilla. See Bp. Lightfoot, Col. iv. 15; and Bingham, ‘Antiquities,’ VIII. i. 13.

*Salute my well-beloved Epænetus.]* The word rendered “*salute*” or “*greet*” is the same throughout the chapter. Of “*Epænetus my well-beloved*,” nothing is known except from this passage.

*who is the first-fruits of Achaia.]* For “*Achaia*,” introduced from 1 Cor. xvi. 15,

7 Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen, and my fellowprisoners, who are of note among the apostles, who also were in Christ before me.

8 Greet Amplias my beloved in the Lord.

9 Salute Urbane, our helper in Christ, and Stachys my beloved.

10 Salute Apelles approved in

read “*Asia*,” and for its geographical meaning see note on Acts ii. 9. Epænetus, St. Paul means, was one of the first converts in Asia, “*the first-fruits*” of the “*offering of the Gentiles*” xv. 16.

In the spurious list of “the Seventy Apostles” ascribed to Hippolytus, Epænetus figures as Bishop of Carthage.

6. *Mary.]* Variations of the text make it uncertain whether Mariam or Maria was of Jewish or Roman origin, and whether the labours which gained her a special greeting were spent on the Apostle (*ἡμᾶς*) or on his readers (*ὑμᾶς*).

7. *my kinsmen.]* Since other Jews are mentioned in the context, e.g. Aquila and Priscilla (v. 3), it is thought that the persons distinguished by St. Paul as his “*kinsmen*” here, and in vv. 11, 21, were members of his family, not merely fellow-countrymen (as in ix. 3). On the other hand it may be said that in writing to a Gentile Church the Apostle might naturally speak of Jewish Christians as his fellow-countrymen or “*kinsmen according to the flesh*” (ix. 3): and the great number of persons to whom the term (*οὐγγενῆς*) is applied in this chapter makes it improbable that they were all of the Apostle’s family.

*fellow-prisoners.]* “*fellow-captives*.” Andronicus and Junia (or Junias, if the name be a man’s) are mentioned with especial honour; as soldiers of Christ they had shared at some time in St. Paul’s captivity (see 2 Cor. vi. 5; xi. 23; and Col. iv. 10): though not themselves here styled “*Apostles*,” as Chrysostom and others have thought (see note at end) they were well known to the Apostles, and had been among the earliest disciples (cf. Acts xxi. 16), having become Christians before St. Paul himself.

8, 9. *Amplias.]* A contraction of Amplatus, which fuller form is common in the sepulchral inscriptions of persons connected with Cæsar’s household (see Introd. § 8).

The next name “*Urbane*,” (or “*Urban*,” not “*Urbane*”) is found, as here, in juxtaposition with Amplias in a list of imperial freedmen, on an inscription A.D. 115.

10r.  
friends.10r.  
friends.

Christ. Salute them which are of Aristobulus' *household*.

11 Salute Herodion my kinsman. Greet them that be of the *household* of Narcissus, which are in the Lord.

12 Salute Tryphaena and Tryphosa, who labour in the Lord.

*our helper in Christ.*] Rather, “**Our fellow-labourer in Christ;**” not a personal companion of St. Paul, like those whom he calls “*my fellow-labourers*” (*vv. 3, 21*), but one active in the same cause of Christ, with St. Paul and his readers.

“*Stachys*” has no distinction but that of being, like Ampliatus, dear to the Apostle in Christian love.

The names Stachys, Apelles, Aristobulus, Narcissus, Tryphaena, and Tryphosa, Rufus, Hermes, Hermas, Patrobus, Philologus, Julia, and Nereus occur more or less frequently in inscriptions of Cæsar's household. (See Introd. § 8, and Bp. Lightfoot's ‘*Philippians*,’ p. 172.)

10. *Apelles approved in Christ.*] *I.e.* the tried Christian: as Origen suggests, Apelles had probably endured much tribulation, and so had been tried and approved: cf. *v. 3, 4*. The name occurs as that of a Jew in Horace, *i Sat. v. 100*.

*Aristobulus' household.*] Literally, “those of Aristobulus,” more probably his servants than kinsmen (*1 Cor. i. 11*). As only certain of them (*τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Α.*) are saluted, namely, as in *v. 11*, those who were “*in the Lord*,” it is likely that Aristobulus himself was not a Christian.

It is not improbable that this Aristobulus was “Aristobulus the younger” (Joseph. ‘*Antiq.*’ xx. i. 2), the grandson of Herod the Great, and brother of Agrippa and Herod, kings of Judaea and Chalcis, who lived in Rome in a private station (*Bell. Jud. II. xi. 6*), and died there *not before A.D. 45*.

Being very friendly to the Emperor Claudius (*Jos. ‘Antiq.’ I. c.*) he may have bequeathed his slaves to him, and they thus became part of Cæsar's household, though still distinguished by the name of their late master: as servants of Aristobulus many of them would naturally be Jews, and so likely to become hearers of the Gospel. See Lightfoot on *Philippians*, p. 172, and ‘*Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*,’ “*Aristobulus*,” 5.

11. *Herodion my kinsman.*] See on *v. 7*. Being St. Paul's kinsman Herodion was a Jew, and very probably (as we may conjecture from his name and the immediate juxtaposition) one “*of the household of Aristobulus*.” (Lightfoot.)

Salute the beloved Persis, which laboured much in the Lord.

13 Salute Rufus chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine.

14 Salute Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermas, Patrobas, Hermes, and the brethren which are with them.

*Greet them that be of the household of Narcissus, which are in the Lord.*] This was probably the wealthy and powerful freedman of Claudius, whose death in prison in the year A.D. 55 is described by Tacitus, Ann. xiii. 1. In this case there is no real anachronism, as Lucht thinks, p. 147. For either by confiscation, which Lucht supposes, or by the law of succession, the household of the freedman of Claudius would pass into the possession of Nero, retaining the name of their deceased owner under the form *Narcissiani, οἱ Ναρκισσῶν*. See ‘*Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiq.*’ “*Libertus*,” and Lightfoot, ‘*Philippians*,’ p. 173.

12. *Tryphaena* is made a prominent character in the Apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla.

*Tryphaena* and *Tryphosa* were probably sisters. Their names both meaning “dainty” or “luxurious” are contrasted with their “toiling” in the Lord. Both names are found in connexion with the imperial household about this date.

Observe how St. Paul distinguishes “*Persis*” as “*the beloved*,” not “*my beloved*,” as in *v. 8*. Her many labours in the Lord were performed on some definite occasion now past; Tryphaena and Tryphosa were labouring still.

13. *Rufus*, though his name is common, is supposed to be son of Simon of Cyrene (Mark xv. 21), for St. Mark, who probably wrote at Rome, assumes that Alexander and Rufus are well known.

*chosen in the Lord.*] Rather, *the chosen*. The title seems to be added as expressing some special excellence, and not simply that Divine election which is common to all Christians. Compare 1 Pet. ii. 4, Sap. Salom. iii. 14, *τὴς πίστεως χάρις ἐκλεκτῆ*, and Baruch iii. 30, *Χρυσίου ἐκλεκτοῦ*.

*his mother and mine.*] A graceful acknowledgment of maternal love and care bestowed, we know not when, on the Apostle. The father and brother seem to be dead, if this be the Rufus of St. Mark.

14. *Asyncritus, Phlegon, and Hermes*, are wholly unknown, though catalogued by the

15 Salute Philologus, and Julia, Nereus, and his sister, and Olympas, and all the saints which are with them.

16 Salute one another with an holy kiss. The churches of Christ salute you.

Pseudo-Hippolytus as Bishops of Hyrcania, Marathon, and Dalmatia.

In the same list "*Patrobas*" (or *Patrobius*) appears as *Patrobulus*, Bishop of Puteoli: he may have been a dependant of *Patrobius*, the powerful freedman of Nero, whose death is recorded by Tacitus, *Hist.* i. 49, ii. 95. (Lightfoot, '*Philippians*,' p. 174.)

*Hermas.*] Origen's conjecture on this passage that this *Hermas* was the author of "*The Shepherd*" is of no weight against the contemporary evidence of the Muratorian Canon, A.D. 170 circ.: "*Hermas composed 'The Shepherd' very lately in our times* in the city of Rome, while the Bishop *Pius* his brother sat in the chair of the Roman Church." Compare Westcott on the Canon, pp. 217-220, and Lightfoot, '*Philipp.*' p. 167.

*the brethren which are with them.*] Origen suggests on v. 15 that these were the household servants of the persons above named. Others, with greater probability, have imagined them to be members of a separate Christian congregation at Rome, similar to those mentioned in v. 5 and v. 15.

15. *Philologus* and *Julia* were probably man and wife, or possibly brother and sister: a Caius Julius *Philologus* is mentioned in an inscription (Murat. p. 1586, 3) as freedman of Caius. Thus both names point to a connection with "the household of Cæsar."

On "*Nereus*" and his legendary history see "Dictionary of Bible," and Jer. Taylor, "*Marriage Ring*," Part I. p. 209.

His sister was probably called *Nereis*, and a Claudia *Nereis* is mentioned as a freed-woman of Augustus (Lightfoot).

"*Olympas*" is mentioned in the list of the Pseudo-Hippolytus. See note on v. 5.

*Salute one another with an holy kiss.*] The ancient custom of the East, particularly among the Jews, of uniting a greeting with a kiss, became among Christians a holy symbol of loving fellowship in the Lord. (Compare i. 7, note on *xápus*.)

In 1 Thess. v. 26, St. Paul requests the leaders of the Church to "*salute all the brethren with a holy kiss*," seemingly in *bis* name and as a token of *bis* love.

Here and in 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12 "*a kiss of charity*" (1 Pet. v. 14) is to be given and received by each member

17 Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them.

18 For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their

of the Church in token of *their love to one another*.

This "mystic" (Clem. Al.) or symbolic "kiss of peace" (Tert.), "the Lord's kiss" (Ap. Const. ii. 57) was embodied in the Eucharistic office as early as the time of Justin Martyr (Apol. i. 65 A.D.): it occurred immediately before the oblation of the gifts, and its use is thus defined in the so-called 'Apostolic Constitutions': "Let the Bishop salute the Church and say, The peace of God be with you all. And let the people answer, And with thy spirit: and let the deacon say to all, Salute ye one another with the holy kiss. And let the clergy salute the Bishop, the men of the laity salute the men, the women the women." viii. 11.

The custom is retained in the Greek Church.

*The churches.*] "*All*" the churches. Compare v. 19, and i. 8. The expression need not be limited to the churches visited by St. Paul: he knew the good will of all towards the Romans, and so speaks for all.

#### 17-20. A WARNING AGAINST FALSE TEACHERS.

17. *divisions and offences.*] The articles in the Greek imply that "*the divisions and the offences*," which had been caused in other Churches by false teachers, were known to the readers, not necessarily that the same evils were already prevalent among themselves.

The contrary is rather implied by the absence of any such expression as "among you," and by the emphasis on the Pronoun in the clause "*contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned.*"

The Apostle fears lest false teachers, such as those who had caused so much trouble elsewhere, might appear at Rome, and so exhorts his readers "*to mark them*," i.e. to watch them carefully and keep out of their way.

Bp. Lightfoot, '*Philippians*,' iii. 18, thinks that the warning is directed against persons belonging to the same party to which the passages vi. 1-23; xiv. 1-xv. 6, are chiefly addressed. See Introduction, § 8.

18. *our Lord Jesus Christ.*] "*Our Lord Christ.*" In "*serve not*," the negative has

own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.

19 For your obedience is come abroad unto all men. I am glad therefore on your behalf: but yet I would have you wise unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil.

<sup>10r.  
harmless.</sup> from its position an emphatic force equivalent to "refuse to serve." The further description of men who serve "*their own belly*," i.e. who give themselves up to sensual indulgence, indicates a class of false teachers like the adversaries of the Apostle at Philippi, "*whose God is their belly*" (Phil. iii. 19).

*by good words and fair speeches.*] Read, "**by their kind and flattering speech**," or, "**by their kind speech and praise.**" The meaning of *χρηστολογία* is not disputed: Fritzsche, followed by Meyer, takes *εἰλογία* in the sense of "eloquence" or "fine expression," as in Plato ('Rep.' iii. 400 D), and Lucian (Alexiphanes i. near the beginning). Fritzsche thinks that St. Paul has used *εἰλογία* in this unusual sense for the sake of the pointed alliteration and antithesis between *χρηστολογία* referring to the *contents*, and *εὐλογία* to the *form* of the discourse.

But two words combined under one Article ought to express cognate ideas, rather than two ideas so distinct as those of "kindness" and "eloquence" (Philippi).

The meaning "praise" (Plato, 'Axiocles' 365, A) is much nearer to the usual Scriptural sense, "blessing;" compare Rev. v. 12. That the "praise" here meant is false and "flattering" is implied not in the word, but in the context.

*deceive the hearts of the simple.*] Rather, "**of the innocent**" (All the English versions except Geneva and A.V.). See Prov. xiv. 15. The same word (*ἀκάκος*) is applied in Heb. vii. 26 to Christ, in whom "innocence" is combined with the fulness of wisdom and knowledge but in others it is often akin to a simplicity which is easily deceived. See Trench, 'N. T. Synonyms,' 2nd Series; and Ruhnken, 'ad Tim.' p. 18.

19. The connexion and arguments are made quite clear by the emphatic position of *ὑπόν*. "The innocent they deceive, but they ought not to deceive you, who are not mere innocents, for *your* obedience is come abroad unto all men." Compare i. 8.

*I am glad therefore on your behalf.*] Rather, "**Over you therefore I rejoice.**" In the right reading, *ἐφ' ὑμῖν οὖν χαιρῶ* (Tisch. 8),

20 And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly. <sup>10r.  
tread.</sup> The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen.

21 Timotheus my workfellow, and Lucius, and Jason, and Sosipater, my kinsmen, salute you.

22 I Tertius, who wrote this epistle, salute you in the Lord.

the position of the pronoun is again emphatic: there is "a delicate combination of warning with the expression of firm confidence" (Meyer). Only, the *confidence* is expressed first: this is characteristic of St. Paul.

*but yet I would have you wise unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil.*] Rather, "*Yet I wish you to be wise unto that which is good, but pure towards evil.*" On the word *ἀκίνατος*, "pure," unmixed, unalloyed with evil, see Trench and Ruhnken, as above on v. 18; and compare Matt. x. 16; Phil. ii. 15. By the general expression "*wise unto that which is good*" St. Paul means, especially, wise in discerning and adhering to the truth which they had learned.

20. Warning is followed by encouragement. They who cause dissension (v. 17) are instruments of Satan: "*but the God (who is the author) of peace shall crush Satan under your feet shortly.*"

There is an evident allusion to the promise in Gen. iii. 15.

"He says not 'shall subdue,' but '**shall crush**', and not them only but their leader '*Satan*': and not simply '**shall crush**' but '*under your feet*,' so that they gain the victory themselves, and are made illustrious by the trophy. From the time also there is comfort again, for he adds '*shortly.*'" (Chrysost.)

The passage is very similar to the warning in 2 Cor. xi. 12-15 against the Judaizing adversaries, who are described as ministers of Satan.

*The grace.*] The Apostle's concluding benediction is here given in its original form: compare 1 Thess. v. 28, 2 Thess. iii. 18. On the meaning of "*the grace*," see i. 7.

"*Amen*" is not found in the best MSS. On the repetition of the benediction, see Introduction, § 8.

"And thus he brings his discourse becomingly to an end in prayer: '*The grace of our Lord.*' For this he loves ever to make a foundation, this a conclusion." (Chrysost.)

#### 21-23. SALUTATIONS FROM ST. PAUL'S COMPANIONS.

21. Timothy had been with St. Paul in Macedonia in the latter part of A.D. 57 (2 Cor.

23 Gaius, mine host, and of the whole church, saluteth you. Erastus the chamberlain of the city saluteth you, and Quartus a brother.

i. 1); whether he had come on with him at once to Corinth is not known. In the opening address (i. 1-7) his name is not associated with St. Paul's as in other Epistles (1 and 2 Thess., 2 Cor., Phil., Col., Philemon). He may therefore have been absent when the Epistle was begun, joining St. Paul just before it was closed, on the eve of his departure for Jerusalem. See Acts xx. 1-4. Timothy was known to some in Rome, at least to Aquila and Priscilla (Acts xviii. 1-5). “Lucius” is certainly not St. Luke (Lucas, or Lucanus), but possibly “Lucius of Cyrene,” Acts xiii. 1.

“Jason” is not improbably the same who is mentioned in Acts xvii. 5, as his home had been at Thessalonica, though he is not one of the Thessalonians mentioned in Acts xx. 4.

Sosipater may be the same as Sopater (son of Pyrrhus) of Berea (Acts xx. 4). See Paley, ‘Horae Paulinae.’

*my kinsmen.]* See vv. 7, 11.

22. “Tertius,” the amanuensis who had hitherto written from St. Paul's dictation and in his name, is now permitted to send a greeting in his own name. To have sent his greeting in the Third Person would have been to treat him as a mere machine (Godet). We have therefore in this little detail an instance of St. Paul's characteristic courtesy, and at the same time a strong proof of the genuineness of the passage: for what forger would have thought of introducing such an incident? See Lucht, p. 81.

Tertius was a very common Roman name, and he was probably an Italian known to many of the readers.

*in the Lord.] I. e. as your brother in Christ.* See 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

23. *Gaius.] I. e. Caius.* Several persons of this name are mentioned in the N. T.

(a.) (1 Cor. i. 14) a member of the Corinthian Church baptized by St. Paul's own hand:

(b.) A Macedonian, St. Paul's companion at Ephesus, Acts xix. 29.

(c.) A native of Derbe in Lycaonia, who soon after this letter was despatched travelled with St. Paul from Corinth to Asia (Acts xx. 4).

(d.) “The well-beloved” brother to whom St. John wrote his 3rd Epistle; celebrated for his hospitality to the Church, and probably residing in some city near Ephesus.

These were probably four distinct persons,

24 The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.

25 Now to him that is of power to stablish you according to my

of whom (a) is the one here mentioned: according to a tradition mentioned by Origen, in his note on this passage, he was Bishop of Thessalonica.

*mine host, and of the whole church.]* St. Paul lodged at this time with Caius, as on his first visit to Corinth with Aquila, and afterwards with Justus (Acts xviii. 1-7). Caius seems either to have lent his house for the meetings of the Church, or more probably to have shown a ready hospitality to all who came to visit the Apostle. St. Paul gratefully recognises this by calling him “*my host and*” (in a more general sense) the host “*of the whole church*”: compare v. 13: “*bis mother, and mine.*”

*Erastus the chamberlain of the city.]* Rather, “the steward,” or “the treasurer of the city.” It is hardly probable that the holder of such an office is the same Erastus whom St. Paul sent forward with Timothy into Macedonia before he himself left Ephesus (Acts xix. 22), and the same who is said (2 Tim. iv. 20) to have remained at Corinth.

*Quartus a brother.] Our brother* (ὁ ἀδελφός), i.e. Quartus who is a brother in the Lord: not the brother of Erastus, or Tertius, as some have conjectured.

24. On the repetition of the benediction, see Introduction, § 8.

25-27. THE DOXOLOGY “rich in contents, and deep in feeling” (Meyer) forms a noble conclusion to this great Epistle. Comparing it with the introduction in c. i. we find in both the same fundamental thoughts of the Epistle: “the power of God unto salvation” (i. 16), the gospel entrusted to St. Paul for the Gentiles (i. 5), the testimony of the Prophets (i. 2), the “obedience to the faith” (i. 5), the acceptance of all nations (i. 5, 14-16), all these thoughts are here gathered up into one harmonious burst of “wonder, love, and praise.”

25. *Now to him that is of power to stablish you.] Now unto him that is able,* &c.: see Eph. iii. 20, Jude 24.

In i. 11 St. Paul has expressed his great desire to visit them in order that they “*may be established.*” The same feeling which is there implied in the use of the Passive Voice (see note on i. 12) is here distinctly expressed: God alone “*is able to stablish you.*”

*according to my gospel.]* Compare ii. 16,

gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began,

and notes there; 1 Tim. i. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 8. The usage of this characteristic phrase, as well as that of the Verb *στηρίζειν* (for which see the note at the end of the chapter), shows that the sense is *not* "to cause you to remain steadfastly faithful to my gospel" (Meyer), but, "to establish you, in accordance with my Gospel," *i. e.* according to the good tidings which I, the Apostle of the Gentiles, announce to you (i. 11, 13).

"By this expression he wishes to indicate the type of Christian teaching which had been revealed to himself personally (Gal. i. 11-16), and of which the two characteristic features were the perfectly gratuitous, and the absolutely universal character of its salvation" (Godet).

*and the preaching of Jesus Christ.]* Either, "what is preached concerning Jesus Christ," or, "what Jesus Christ preached," *i. e.* through me His Apostle. The latter is favoured by the passages in which *κήρυγμα* is followed by a Genitive (Matt. xii. 41; Luke xi. 32; 1 Cor. ii. 4, xv. 14), and is explained by Meyer as "a more precise definition proceeding from the humble piety of the Apostle. As he wrote or uttered the words 'my gospel,' he at once vividly felt that his gospel was without nothing else than the preaching which Christ Himself caused to go forth (through him as His organ)" ch. xv. 18; 2 Tim. iv. 17. But the other meaning, "what is preached concerning Jesus Christ," is simpler and better suited to the context, which requires that the Gospel should be characterised according to its great subject Jesus Christ (i. 3, ii. 16, x. 8-12; Gal. i. 6-8), and gives no special occasion for such an expression of St. Paul's personal humility as Meyer imagines.

*according to the revelation of the mystery.]* In form and construction this clause exactly corresponds to the preceding, and *κατά* has the same sense in both: the truth that God "is able to establish you" is in accordance with "my gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ" in accordance with "a revelation of a mystery." For a similar construction of *κατά*, repeated in co-ordinate clauses, see Col. ii. 8. The two clauses are also most closely connected in sense, as if St. Paul had said, "my gospel, the gospel which I preach concerning Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, is a revelation of a mystery that has been long hidden."

Elsewhere St. Paul tells us how he had received his own knowledge of Christ, namely,

26 But now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known

"*by revelation*" (Gal. i. 12; cp. Gal. i. 16, 1 Cor. ii. 10), *i. e.* by a Divine enlightenment of his soul proceeding from the Holy Spirit.

But as in i. 17 he has said that in the gospel is revealed the righteousness of God, so here the parallel clause "*according to my gospel*," and the context, especially the latter part of v. 26, show that he is speaking of a revelation made to all men in the Gospel.

On the meaning of *μυστήριον*, see note on xi. 25. Here in the Doxology, as in 1 Cor. ii. 7, the word denotes the divine purpose of salvation, as a secret long kept in silence, but now made known for obedience of faith unto all the Gentiles.

This special application of *μυστήριον* is quite in accordance with its place in this Epistle, and there is no ground for Lucht's objection that this use of the word is not earlier than the Epistle to the Ephesians. Cp. Ephes. iii. 3-5, 9; Col. i. 26, 27; ii. 2; iv. 3; and the striking phrase in Luke ii. 32, *φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψων ἔθνων*.

*which was kept secret.]* Which hath been kept in silence. The Passive of *στήνω* is not unusual in classical Greek.

*since the world began.]* Literally, "in times eternal": the Dative being used as in Acts viii. 11; xiii. 20. But the A.V. rightly retains Tyndale's excellent paraphrase, which expresses more correctly the idea of times reaching back to eternity: 2 Tim. i. 9; Tit. i. 2. These "times" of silence had lasted until the mystery was revealed in the preaching of the Gospel.

26. *But now is made manifest.]* "But is manifested now." Cp. Col. i. 26; iv. 4. "The Old Testament is as it were a clock in its silent course: the N.T. is the sound and stroke of the bell" (Bengel).

*and by the scriptures of the prophets.]* "*and by prophetic scriptures.*" The *τε* is undoubtedly genuine, and connects the two Particles *γνωρισθέντος* and *φανερωθέντος*. The mystery or secret was not only brought to light and manifested (*φανερωθέντος*) "by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ" (2 Tim. i. 10), but it was also made generally known and published abroad (*γνωρισθέντος*), and St. Paul goes on to tell us (1) by what means, (2) at whose command, (3) for what purpose, and (4) to what extent this publication was made.

(1) On the use of "prophetic scrip-

to all nations for the obedience of faith:

27 To God only wise, be glory

**tures**" in making this mystery known see Luke xxiv. 27; Acts xiii. 23-41; xvii. 2, 11; xxvi. 22, 27; and cp. Rom. i. 2; iii. 21; and the numerous prophecies quoted in the Epistle, especially those which refer to the Gentiles in c. xv.

(2) The clause "*according to the commandment of the everlasting God*" is most appropriate, because none but "The Eternal" could cause the "stewards of his mysteries" to make known that which had been "*kept secret since the world began.*" Cp. 1 Tim. i. 1; Tit. i. 3.

(3) *for the obedience of faith.*] "*for obedience to faith*": see i. 5 and note.

(4) *made known to all nations.*] "*unto all the nations is made known.*" The

knowledge of the mystery is extended unto (*εἰς*) all the Gentile nations, because they are all included in the blessing of Abraham.

27. *To God only wise, be (the) glory through Jesus Christ.*] On the difficult question of the right reading, construction, and interpretation of the verse, see Introduction, § 8.

The passage as rendered in A.V. presents no difficulty, and the thought that God alone is wise (whatever be its origin in 1 Tim. i. 17; Jude 25) is here naturally suggested by the context, and by the whole argument of the Epistle, in which the Apostle has been already forced to exclaim in adoring wonder, "*O the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past finding out!*"

#### ADDITIONAL NOTES on vv. 7, 25.

7. Chrysostom holding *Iouvaria* to be a woman's name, nevertheless thinks that she with Andronicus is here described as an Apostle. Origen says it is possibly meant that they were of the seventy.

Dr. Lightfoot ('Galatians,' p. 93 note) adopts this view as favouring his theory of the extensive meaning of the term "Apostle."

But usage seems to be opposed to it. Thus in Eurip. 'Hippol.' 103, it is said of Aphrodite, *σεμνὴ μέντοι καπίσημος ἐν βροτοῖς*. Compare Hec. 379, *ἐπιθλῶν γενέσθαι δευτὸς χαρακτῆρι καπίσημος ἐν βροτοῖς*. Psalm. Sal. ii. 6 (ap. Hilgenfeld, 'Messias Judæorum') *ἐν ἐπισήμῳ ἐν τοῖς ζθνεσιν.*

In reference to the first passage quoted from Euripides, Godet asks—"But why not translate quite simply, 'illustrious among mortals'? And in the same way, and with still stronger reason, here, 'illustrious among those many evangelists, who by their missionary labours in the countries of the East, have merited the name of *Apostles*.'"

M. Godet has missed the point of the quotation: Aphrodite, "illustrious among mortals," was not a mortal herself. In the same way, Andronicus and Junias, "*of note among the Apostles*," were not Apostles themselves.

25. *στηρίζειν.* Of the five other passages in which the word occurs, only two (2 Thess. ii. 17; 2 Peter i. 12) are cited by Meyer in favour of his interpretation, "Cause you to remain steadfastly faithful to my Gospel," and in both these the Preposition connecting *στηρίζειν* with the following words is *ἐν*, not *κατά*. The only remaining examples (Luke ix. 51; xvi. 26; 1 Thess. iii. 13) add nothing to the argument for the closer connection.

The Verb usually stands by itself in the sense of "confirm" or "establish": see i. 11; 1 Thess. iii. 2; 2 Thess. iii. 3; also Luke xxii. 32; James v. 8; 1 Peter v. 10; Apoc. iii. 2.

LONDON:  
PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED,  
STAMFORD STREET AND CHARING CROSS.

31



DATE DUE





